

Balraves.

A

# SOLVTION

OF

DOCTOR RESOLVTVS.

His

Resolutions for kneeling.

Ambrosius in 1. Cor. 11.

*Indignus est Domino, qui aliter mysterium celebrat,  
quam ab eo traditum est. Non enim potest Devo-  
tus esse, qui aliter presumit, quam datum est ab  
auctore.*

He is unvvorthy of the Lord, vvho doth  
celcbrate the mystery othervvayes, then as it  
vvas delivered by the Lord. For he can not  
be Devote, vvho presumeth othervvayes, then  
the author hath delivered.



M. D C. X I X.

Cyprianus ad Cæcilianum ,  
Lib: 2. Epist. 3.

**R**eligioni nostra congruit , & timori & officio sacerdotij nostri custodire traditionis Dominica veritatem : & quod prius videtur apud quosdam erratum , domino monente corrigere , ut cum claritate sua , & maiestate caelesti venire caperit , inueniat nos tenere quod monuit , observare quod docuit , facere quod fecit .

It agreeth fitly with our religion, and the feare & dutie of our priesthood , to keepe the verity of the Lords tradition : and wherein any errour seeme to have been committed before , to correct the same , wher the Lord doth admonish ws, that when he shall begin to come with his brightnes and heavenly majesty , he may find ws to hold that which he commanded, to observe that which he taught , and to do that which he did.

## TO THE READER.



*WE* are become so *Apish* in the imitation of the English patterne, that where we cannot imitate in substance, yet we will imitate in imaginary formes. Amongst other strange novelties, it behoved us to have Doctors of Divinity; whether they be sufficiently qualified or not. About five yeare agoe, some ministers aspiring to Bishopricks, were inaugurate Academisall doctors, as it pleased the Arch-bishop of St. Andrewes Mr. Spottilwood, that learned Rabbi, to admit or allow. Mr. David Lindsay, our master Doctor, so defended the article of kneeling at Perth Assembly, that he did save the credit of the rest of the Doctors, who had been all put to shame unles he had undertaken the burthen, as he himselfe gave out afterward. But how well did he plead the Kings cause, when he was driven to confesse, they had neither scripture reason, nor antiquity, and that he condescended onely to avert the Kings wrath from our Kirk? But the Doctor baited with benefites, and hope of promotion to a Bishoprick, which he doth now enjoy, hes since that time notwithstanding set forth in print a new light, revealing unto him both scripture, reason, and antiquity. Seeing the Doctor stileth arrogantly his reasons Resolutions; let him be called Doctor Resolutus for Scotland, as Iohannes de Baccone of old was so called for England, that in this also we may be conforme. He marcheth under Dissipate, the martiall motto of the Con-

*stables Armes; but I will march under Colligite, the martiall motto of Christs Standaaad, and will encounter not with Goliah, but with Thraſo, for so I hope the Reader shall finde him. The halfe of his booke needeth no answer: I will answer therefore onely so much as concerneth the matter of kneeling: let the iudicious Reader conferre this answer with his Resolutions, and try boldly, if I have dealt faithfully. The Lord preserve so many as do yet stand to their oath and profession, that they may continue constant, and not be carried away with every light wind of erroneous doctrine, nor cast down with terrors and threatnings. Such as are already fallen, the Lord give them remorse of conscience, and grace to recover thetr fall. Let us all possesse our soules in patience, and cry to God for the dayes of old, and then he will return and repaire the breaches made in our walles, and purge our Temples of the corruptions which are already entred.*

---

## CHAP.





# CHAP. I.

*A tablegesture is necessarie.*



He Doctior taketh needlesse paines to proue sitting in the act of receiuing the Sacramentall clements of bread and wine, not to be necessary. For we hold not sitting in special absolutely necessary in the act of receiuing, but a table-gesture in generall, whether sitting or standing about the table, we hold necessary; howbeit not to the essence, yet to the right

ministration of the Sacrament. And of these two table gestures. VVe hold sitting most agreeable to the institution: for Christ setting down before his Apostles, a patterne conforme where unto they should celebrate that holy action thereafter, celebrate the same sitting: and this gesture ought not to be changed, no not in an other tablegesture, without some urgent necessity. To stand at the ministers hand, or to take in passing by, we account no table-gesture; for there is no use in that case more of a table-gesture, then if it were a dresfor, or cup-board; and that kind of gesture taketh away the distribution of the communicants, which is not taken away by standing about the table.

CASAVBONVS, doth acknowledge the gesture of Christ and his Apostles at the Paschal supper, to have been not a simple lying, but a gesture consisting partly of sitting, and lying, and alledged not onely the place of Ezekiel, 23. 41. But

Section. 13.

a Exercitat.

16. pag. 490.

Hic situs ne-  
que plane ja-  
centis est, ne-  
que plane se-  
dentis: Idcir-  
co hebrei hoc  
dixerunt sede-  
re in lectis.

also Onkelos the Chaldee paraphrast, expressing the sitting of Iosephs brethren, by a word which the Syrians use to expresse, sitting with leaning: and Iosephus expressing it by the word Cataclitus, the proper word used to signifie the gesture received in Christs time: thereafter he alledgeth the phrase of the Rabbins, which they use to expresse sitting with leaning. Seeing therefore the Hebrew, Chaldaick and Rabbinical writers do interpret the one word indifferently by the other, our vulgar translators have done right in expressing Christs gesture by the word, sitting. The Doctor himselfe at perth assembly, confessed that our gesture of upright sitting, and his Apostles gesture at the Paschal supper, were Analoga. If Christ had celebrated the Paschal supper in the dayes of DAVID or SALOMON, before the custome of sitting at table in beds entred among the Iewes, he had used the gesture of upright sitting, as the Iewes did then, and as the Iewes do at this day, when they celebrate the Paschal Supper.

Sect. 2.  
Argum. 1.

His first argument against the necessity of sitting, the uncertainty of Christs sitting, and the likelihood that they stood or kneeled at the blessing, and continued the same gesture throughout the whole action. The testimony of Athenæus of the custome of the Naucratices, will not make it probable that Christ kneeled at the blessing. VVhat Ethnickes did on the birth day of Vesta, or festivitie of Apollo, Comæus was no pattern to Christ to imitate. Neither was it Christ constant gesture to kneele in time of prayer or blessing. It was the custome of the Iewes to sit in the time of the blessing of the bread, and the cup of praise in the last act of the Paschal Supper, and the words were summarie, that they were sooner pronounced, then they could conveniently change their gesture. Christ no doubt, at all the Pascall suppers before kept the ordinary custome. If at other Paschal suppers, why not also at this? And if at this Paschal supper, why not at the Eucharistical? except we will think that the one required kneeling more then the other. VVhile as the Disciples were sitting at table in Emaus, Christ gave thanks, and Math. 14. after the people were placed and set on the ground, Christ gave thanks looking up to heaven onely. This lifting up of the eyes to heaven was indeed familiar with Christ, even when he went about some miraculous or extraordinary work, Ioh: 11. 41. VVhen he was

*A table-gesture is necessarie.* 7

he was to raise Lazarus, he gave thanks lifting up his eyes. And when he went out after supper to the garden, and prayed that prayer Ioh. 17. It is said onely that he lifted up his eyes. The Liturgie ascribed to Iames and Ambrose,<sup>b</sup> constantly affirme, that he lifted up his eyes also when he gave thanks at the Eucharistical supper: no further do they affirme.

b De Sacrament. lib. 4. cap. 5.

Put the case the Doctors conjecture were true, it will not follow that Christ and his Apostles continued the gesture of standing or kneeling throughout the whole action. They could not stand all the time: for their sitting with leaning on their left elbowes, and their breasts, towards the table, required the table to be so neere, that they might not stand betwixt the beds and the table. They could not stand upon their beds; for then their feet had been neerer to the table then their hands or their heads. Christ sayd, Arise, let us go hence, Ioh: 14. 31. How could they arise if they wer already standing? It behoved them therefore either to sit or to kneele.

I prove they kneeled not by the reasons following: 1. If there had been such a change from sitting to kneeling, the Evangelists would not have omitted it, seeing it had been so great a change from the accustomed and ordinary table-gesture used at all times before at the Paschal supper, unto a gesture of adoration, a gesture of a farre different nature and kinde. The Evangelists make mention of all other changes made in passing from the last act of the Paschal supper to the Evangelicall. There is no reason therefore to think that they omitted this. There is no circumstance of their texts that doth insinuate any such change, but rather the contrary, that while they were eating, and consequently while they were sitting still, Christ tooke bread and gave thanks. 2. If Christ changed sitting into kneeling, then kneeling is a part of the institution: & so all the Kirkes which have not kneeled since Christs his dayes, shall be guiltie of transgressing the institution. For this I hold as a ground: That whatsoever change Christ made, in changing the last act of the Paschal supper into the Eucharistical, was a part of the institution; namely when the change is made to a rite of worship or adoration. For to what end els should the change have been made, if it was not to be practised afterward as a part of the institution? Now our opposites do acknowledge, that kneeling is indifferent, & consequently

not

not a part of the institution. 3. Christ at the delivery of the elements, spake in an enunciative form; This is my body that is broken for you: and not in form of a prayer, saying in the Gregorian stile; The body of the Lord prelerve thee both body and soule to life everlasting, or in any other such forme of prayer. Therefore the Apostles kneeled not in the act of receiving. And this I hold as an other ground: That kneeling was never practised in the Apostolicall Kirk in time of divine service, but in the action of publick prayer or thanksgiving, nor ought not to be practised but at the sayd times. Our opposites in our neighbour Kirk pretend that they kneele in regard of the prayer uttered at the delivery of the elements. The ministers of Lincoln denude them of this pretence: yet their alledgance confirmeth my assertion. 4. The elements were carried from hand to hand, and divided by the communicants amongst themselves. Now our opposites themselves do not admit as compatible, the kneeling of the communicants, and the distributing of the elements amongst themselves.

This last reason is proved at length in Perth Assembly, where unto I referre the Reader, I adde onely for further confirmation, the authorities both of Papists and Protestants, applying the precept Luk 22. 17. Divide it amongst you, to the communion cup. Barradius<sup>c</sup> followeth Augustine and Euthymius, because Luke subjoyneth to that precept, the same protestation that Mathew and Mark do subjoyne to the communion cup; to wit, that Christ would drink no more of the fruit of the vine, untill, &c. and that the cause of the anticipation was, that the protestation of not drinking more might be joyned with the protestation of not eating more. Iansenius<sup>d</sup> is moved with the same reason, and because the thanksgiving mentioned in the 17. verse is omitted, when Luke returneth afterward to speake of the same cup, because it was already expressed. Maldonatus<sup>e</sup> sayth, that when Christ gave the cup to one, least he should seeme to will him onely to drink, he sayd, Drink ye all of it, which Luke expressed in clearer tearmes, cap. 22. 17. saying, Divide it among you. VValterius<sup>f</sup> sayth likewise, that the cup was carried from hand to hand. As for our own writers, Hospinianus<sup>g</sup> sayth, It is manifest, that Christ gave not the cup to every one severally,

<sup>c</sup> Tom. 4.  
lib. 3. cap. 1.

<sup>d</sup> Concordia  
Evangelica,  
cap. 151.

<sup>e</sup> In Math. 26.  
27.

<sup>f</sup> Detriplici  
coena. page  
215.  
<sup>g</sup> Historie fa-  
cramentarie  
part. 1. lib. 1.  
Cap. 1.

rally, but onely to the first, and the first reached it to the second, & so forth. Erasmus in his paraphrase h sayth, it is observed by the Ancients, that Luke maketh twice mention of the communion cup. Piscator in his Analysis on Luke, sayth, <sup>h</sup> It is cleare that the words are to be understood of the cup of the Lords supper. Gualter <sup>h</sup> likewise beginneth the institution at the 17. verse. Mornæus <sup>h</sup> sayth, Christ gave the cup when he sayd, Drink ye all of it: Divide it among you. Sibrandus <sup>m</sup> speaketh to the same purpose. Calvin in his Institutions <sup>n</sup> Beza in his last annotations in the same place, <sup>o</sup> VVillets, <sup>p</sup> Bilson, <sup>p</sup> Iewel, <sup>q</sup> and many moe might be cited to the same effect howbeit Bellarmine is loath to grant that precept to be meant of the communion cup, because of the fruit of the vine, mentioned in the protestation subjoynd, which maketh against transubstantion, yet he granteth the matter itselfe, to wit, that the cup was divided, <sup>r</sup> & reached frō one to another. And Becanus the Iesuit <sup>s</sup> sayth, Drink ye all of it, is all one with take & divide it among you. Now as the cup was divided among the communicants so was likewise the bread: for as Christ sayd, take ye in the plurall number, drink ye; so he sayd, take ye, eate ye, and not take thou, eare thou. Analogie requireth, that the bread should be divided among the communicants, as well as the cup. It were strange to see the minister remain in his own place when the cup is carried from hand to hand, and to goe along the table to dispense the element of the bread. Hospinianus, Mornæus, Sibrandus and others, make the precept, divide it among you, common both to the bread and the cup. Cajerane <sup>t</sup> confesseth that Christ was so farre distant from some of them, that he could not deliver the bread to every one severally, more then the cup. The later confession of Helvetia subscribed not onely by the Tygurines, and their confederates of Bern, Sca-phusia, Sangallia, Rhetia; but also by the Kirkes of Geneva, Savoy, Polonie, Hungarie, and Scotland, anno 1566, hath these words, <sup>v</sup> : Ourwardly the bread is offered by the minister, and the words of the Lord are heard, Receive, eate, This is my body: divide it amongst you, drink ye all of this, This is my blood. Suppose it were granted, that the Apostles divided onely the cup, and Christs precept concern the dividing of the cup onely, and not the bread, yet it is sufficient for our purpose, seeing the communicants must compasse the table with a

h Luc. cap. 22.  
17.  
i Cap. 22. 17  
h In Luke 22.  
17.  
l De Euchar.  
lib. 2. cap. 12  
p. 154 in folio  
m In cateches.  
palatino bel-  
gica, quest. 75.  
n Lib. 4. c. 17.  
sect. 43.  
o De Euchar.  
quest 4. p. 545  
p Obedience  
pag. 495  
q Of private  
Masse, divisi, 8  
r De Euchar.  
lib. 4. cap. 25.  
s De commu-  
nione sub  
utraque specie  
pag. 155.

t In Math. 26.

v Chap. 27

table-gesture, to the end they may divide the cup among themselves. For if every one take the cup severally out of the ministers hand kneeling, Christs precept concerning the cup is transgressed. I thinke no man will be so absurd as to say, that we should kneele when we receive the bread, but not when we receive the wine. VVhen Mr. Struthers was urged with this dividing of the communicants, he answered; Is it not better to take it out of the hands of the Minister, then of an adulterer? It was replied by the Minister proponer; what if the minister be a Iudas? I at k, if holy Sixtus and St. Laurence, gave the bread and cup out of their own hands, when the Arch-Bishop of St. Andrewes, and Mr. Gladstones his Arch-deacon gave them to the communicants, all the communicants are presumed to be penitent sinners, & holy persons; neither doth the vertue of the Sacrament depend upon the morall dignity of him that ministrereth, or of him that distributeth. And this far for confirmation of the fourth reason, referring the reader for further satisfaction, to Pert Assembly.<sup>x</sup>

x Pag. 41. 42  
43. 44.

VVhen the bready god was adored in the time of most grosse superstition, the popish Doctors were not so shamelesse, as to deny Christ and his Apostles sitting, to maintaine their kneeling. The old verse, *Rex sedet in cena*, &c. was current among them. Iohannes de Turrecremata, calleth it, *versum antiquorum*, a verse of the y ancients, and Thomas Aquinas, their Angelical Doctor, citeth it to prove that Christ took the Sacrament himselse, <sup>z</sup> but our Doctor in another sence Angellicall, is become so impudent to call in question that which no ancient or moderne writer did call in question before this last yeare. Mr. P. Galloway after the reading of Mr. Doctors Book, in writ, became incontinently so profound a clark, that upon the reconciliation day before the last communion, when the body of the Town of Edinburgh were assembled with their Ministers, he would take in hand to prove a strange paradox, to wit, that Christ and his Apostles sat not at the supper. No, sayd Mr. Andrew Ramsay, say not that brother. O sayd Mr. Struthers, gybing and jesting at the people all the time; he sat this way & counterfeited Christs table-gesture, deriding them whom he ought in all lenitie & meeknes to have instructed. But the honest men received nothing at their hands that day to be a vvarrant to their consciences for kneeling, but threatenings

y De Summa  
Ecclesie, lib. 1  
c. 39.  
z 3. quest. 81  
art. 1.  
unde et quida  
metrice dixit.  
Rex sedet in  
cena, turba  
cinctus duo-  
dona.  
Se tenet in  
manibus se-  
cibat, ipse  
cibus,



# *A table-gesture is necessarie.* II

nings from Mr. Galloway, jests and derisions from Mr. Struthers and Mr. Siderse and avernes from hearing their reasons from Mr. Ramfay, who did moderate that meeting.

It is the triviall argument of our opposites that we are no more bound to sitting, or any particular gesture, then we are bound to the time, the place, the order of receiving after meate, the quality of the leavened bread: and that the sitting was occasionall, onely by reason of the Paschall supper specially of the last act thereof, which was changed in the new Sacrament, and that sitting was not chosen of purpose by Christ, or his Apostles. But B. Bilson can tell them <sup>a</sup> that the Lord neither in his speech nor actions, did comprise the time, place, or persons. And Paræus <sup>b</sup> sayih, that the evening, the Inne, the number of twelve, by the consent of all, were not Sacramentall but accidentary circumstances. Christ celebrated in the evening, because the Sacramēt of the new law behoved to succeed the passover, the Sacrament of the old Law, which was ordained by God to be eaten in the evening, and Christ was to be apprehended before the morning. The Paschal supper was ordained to be eaten in Ierusalem, in severall companies and families, and therefore Christ celebrated in an Inne, and to a small company. The Iewes wvere expressly forbidden to have any leavened bread in their houles in time of the passeover. It behoved therefore Christ to celebrate with unleavened bread. All these circumstances were occasionall and unavoydable, by reason of the paschall supper. But Christ might have easily changed into kneeling: for there vvas no expresse commandement given to the people to sit at the Paschall supper. If they stood in Egypt, that standing vvas onely for that time: vwhen they came to Canaan they sate, as Scaliger sayth <sup>c</sup> in argumentum securitatis: or for the proportion and Analogy of other religious feasts, whereat they sate. Seeing Christ might have altered this gesture and did not, but retained as a gesture as fit for the Sacrament of the new Law as it vvas for the Sacrament of the old Law, vvhich is called the oblation of Iehova, Numb. 9. 7. it is evident that it was his will that it should be retained.

He sayth it shall not expressly be found, nor by reason demonstrated, that sitting vvas received at any time after the first institution, either by the Apostles, or any in the primitive or succeeding

Argum. 2.

<sup>a</sup> Obedience, pag 489

<sup>b</sup> In 1. Cor. 11

<sup>c</sup> De emend. temporum lib. 6. in the last Edition.

Argum. 3.



succeeding Churches. VVe may more safely presume that the Apostolicall churches followed Christs example, then he may presume the contrary, which he is never able to prove: The fathers expounding the breaking of bread at Emaus to be the communion, will not deny sitting after the first supper. B. Bilson sayth, <sup>d</sup> that dissention was the thing which defaced the Lours supper among the Corinthians, in that they would neither at common meates, nor at the Lords table sit altogether, but sorted themselves together in factions and companies, as they favoured or friended each other. Beza sayth, <sup>e</sup> that the Love-feasts did no wayes admit geniculation at the Lords supper in the act of receiving and no doubt, the Apostle comparing their partaking of the table of the Lord and the table of divels together 1 Cor 10. 21. did include the gesture with the rest, and oppose the sitting at the Lords table to sitting at table in Idols Chappel. 1 Cor. 8. 10. Durandus <sup>f</sup> sayth, that the Apostles celebrated as Christ did, Et formā observantes in verbis & materiam in rebus, observing both matter and forme: And he sayth, <sup>g</sup> that in the first beginning of the Kirkes, the Apostles used no other words, but the words of the institution for the consecration: he sayth, that they added afterward the Lords prayer, but this is but an uncertain and unwritten tradition. The VValdenses alledge out of Chronica gestorum, that the form of the institution was a long time observed in the Kirk, and that the communicants kneeled not, but sate. <sup>h</sup> Mor-næus testifieth, that there are some foot-steps that remain in the monasteries of St. Bennet, where they have no other masse for three daies before Easter but this form following: The Abbot sanctifieth the bread & the wine, and the Monkes do communicate sitting, receiving the elements out of the Abbots hand. And this form is called by them mandatum, the commandement. Then in the account of the very Benedictines, to sit at table and communicate, is a commandement. VVe must not think the Apostles altered Christs precept, ordaining the communicants to distribute among themselves, but this could not be done but with a table-gesture. The Apostle in rehearsing the institution declareth, that the words of the promise whereunto the seales are annexed of bread & wine, were uttered not in form of a prayer, but in an enunciative form. It followeth therefore according to the ground already layd down.

d Obedience.  
pag. 461.

e Contra Har-  
chium. Aga-  
pas quidem  
ecce constat  
vix ac me vix  
quidem genu-  
flexionem ad-  
missile.

f Rational.  
lib. 4. cap. 1.

g Lib. 6. c. 77

h Apologia  
contra hinas-  
titeras docto-  
ris Augustini.  
Ex isto mani-  
festum est,  
quod primiti-  
va Ecclesia  
hanc fidem  
habuit, et illa  
confessa est et  
non fecit reve-  
rentiam huic  
Sacramento,  
quia illo tem-  
pore exemplo  
Christi seden-  
tes statim ac-  
ceptunt et  
nilul retine-  
runt, nec extra

## *A table-gesture is necessarie.*

13

down, that in the Apostles time the table-gesture, and not kneeling was the gesture of the communicants. But put the case we were destitute of reasons for the sitting of Apostolicall Kirkes, yet as long as we have nothing to prove the contrary, we ought to adhere to the institution. For Calvin sayth, <sup>H</sup> that they who receive as is commanded without adoration, are secure that they depart not from gods commandement, then the which security there can nothing be better when we enterprise any thing. They have the example of the Apostles whom vve read not to have adored prostrate, but as they were sitting they received and did eate. They have the use of the Apostolicall Kirk, where it is declared that the faith-full did communicate, not in adoration, but in breaking of bread.

domm extul-  
lent et hec  
institutio diu  
stetit, sicut  
Chronica ge-  
storum ostendunt.  
v. Tydij  
Waldensia.  
i De Euchar.  
lib. 1. cap. 1.  
<sup>H</sup> Institut. 4.  
cap. 37. sect. 35

Vve omit the washing of feet, why may we not likewise, sayth the Doctor, omit sitting? That Christ did wash his Disciples feet; was an extraordinary example, to teach the Disciples humility, who were contending for majority. The Doctor his head had need to be washed also. But the washing itselfe was an ordinary custome betwixt the first and second service of the Paschall supper. Bernard of old, and Venator one of the Remonstrants of new I would have this Iewish ceremony made a Sacrament and the Doctor a Sacramentale, belonging to the holy communion, but none of them is worthy of confutation.

Argum. 4.

I Hommij con-  
troversie Bel-  
gice in art. 33

He reasoneth now in personam and not from the matter itselfe: for what if there be a fault to kneele in the time of the thanksgiving? followeth it that we should commit a greater fault in the act of receiving. Both minister and people have warrant from other scripture to kneele in time of prayer, but in the very act of banquetting and feasting, we have no warrant at all. Seeing a table-gesture is necessary: it is then most necessary and proper, when we are in the very use of the table eating and drinkeing at it: vve may praye and give thanks before we sit down to our ordinarie repast, but when we begin to eate vve use the Table-gesture. Christ sate at the table all the time of the action. It is true. The Table was short, and the Company but small, and he had

Arg. 5. and 6.

he had all his guests within his view. The Minister must act his part in the view of the whole congregation : and therefore they may lawfully change sitting into standing for the edification of the hearers and beholders of the action. Sitting we thought never so necessary, but that it might be changed into another table-gesture when necessitie required.

Argum. 7.

He reasoneth again in personam. It followeth not that we may change sitting, because we conjoyn the blessing of the bread and cup in one blessing, which Christ severed. VVhat if we faile in this, should we faile in the other also? It is true Christ gave several thanks, according to the form of the last act of the paschal supper, but when we joyne them in one thanksgiving, is any thing omitted which ought to have been done? Is not the cup blessed, when it is blessed with the bread? Next, is the frame of the institution broken when there is but one common thanksgiving. But when the table-gesture is changed into a gesture of adoration, the nature and kinde of the gesture is changed. Next, this change draweth with it another great change, to wit, of the order and frame of the institution. The order and frame of the institution requireth that the words uttered at the delivery of the elements, be uttered in an enunciative form. For the words of the institution are not onely narrative, but directive, as the Doctor confessed a litle before. Next, the order and frame of the institution requireth, that the communicants compassing the table, shall divide, the elements among themselves: kneeling putteth all this frame act of joynt, and draweth with it a breach of Christs speciall commandement, Divide amongst you. The conjunct thanksgiving draweth with it none of these changes.

Argum. 8.

He proponeth their triviall argument of pauls rehearfall of the institution, and the Evangelists, where no mention is made of sitting, or any other gesture. By this reason neither a lawfull Minister, nor thanksgiving at the conclusion of the supper, nor a table be necessary for none of these are rehearsed by Paul in the rehearfall of the institution: but Paul presupposeth a lawfull Minister, a table, and a table gesture: for he hath made mention of them already, and here he rehearseth onely the words uttered by the minister to the communicants planted about the table, and proceeding to the very action itselfe. And in his rehearfall he uttered in an enunciative form the words pronoun-

*A table-gesture is necessarie.* 15

pronounced at the delivery of the elements, and not in form of a prayer: and therefore all gesture of adoration at the receiving was excluded, as we have often sayd. The Evangelists say, that while they were eating, Christ took bread: howbeit their eating did not belong to the institution, yet it includeth their gesture, that while they were sitting, Christ took bread, &c. a gesture doth belong to the institution. Out of these words do all writers collect that they sate at supper.

Howbeit we plead for a table-gesture in generall and not for the absolute necessity of sitting in particular, yet how weakly hath the Doctor disputed against it? Sitting indeed we think ought not to be changed, no nor into another table-gesture, without necessity: Iohannes à Lasco exhorted all the ministers in the Reformed Kirks, to remove according to their office and dutie, not onely geniculation, but also standing and taking in severall from the Minister en passant, and to restore the sitting of the communicants at table, again, vvhether it is vvorne out of use.

n In Liturgia  
ecclesiastum  
peregrinatum  
Londini, sub.  
Ed. 6.

---

C H A P. II.

*A table-gesture agreeth best  
With decencie.*

**T**He Doctor goeth about to prove kneeling more decent in the act of receiving, then sitting or any other gesture, and so he carpeth not onely our former order vvhich he preferred before any other at Pert Assembly, but also Christ himselfe as not wise enough to consider vvhether gesture was most decent for so holy an action. If another more commodious and better form could have been devised, out of all doubt, sayth Hospinian, Christ would have instituted it, and the Apostles would have recommended it to the Kirkes, and therefore vvillett, p that if any thing be found

o Historie Sacra-  
mentum  
part. 1. lib. 1.  
cap. 5.  
p Ibidem cap.  
2. §. 1.

found different either in the nature or proper sence of words, or in rite or external ceremony from this rule that it be amended according to the same as the most excellent, most holy, most uncorrupted, most absolute, and most certain rule. If therefore there be any gesture that shall put this rule out of rule: I say it ought not to be esteemed agreeable either to pietie, decency, or charity, let be to be preferred before other gestures.

Sect. 7.

The Doctor laieth down for a ground, that by the table of the Lord, 1. Cor. 10. 21. is not meant a materiall table or the symbolical and externall part onely, but the body and blood of the Lord, because the Apostle sayth, the Corinthians could not partake both of the table of the Lord and of diuels, VVhereas a man may be partaker of both the materiall tables, and drinke both of the materiall cup of the Lord, and the material cup of diuels. It is evident notwithstanding of the Doctors wrangling that the Apostle meaneth also of a materiall table, and the Sacrament by a kind of trope called *Metonymia subiecti*, is denominate from the materiall table whereat the communicants did participate of the elements. The Apostles speaketh not of a natural, but a morall partaking of the Lords table. A man might not lawfully sit at the materiall table of the Lord, and drinke of the materiall cup, and sit also at the materiall table of diuels in the Idols chappels, and drinke of their materiall cups. for that we may do which we may do by Law or right. Now the communicant in sitting at both the materiall tables professed fellowship both vvith god and the diuell as Paul speaketh. for the two materiall tables were symbles of two contrary professions as Aretius in 1. Cor. 10. 21. sayth. for he that eate of the meate of the sacrifice, partaketh of the sacrifice, and he that participateth of the sacrifice, participateth of the religion vvhereunto it belongeth: he that participateth with the religion communicateth with the Idol and false god vvwhose religion it is. The table of diuels vvas a materiall table in the Idols chappell, whereat the Idolater feasted. See Beza 9. Tilenus, Caieranus, VVilletts: t Now if the table of diuels from vvwhich the cursed feasts vvvere denominate, vvvere materiall tables, then the table of the Lord compared vvith them vvas also materiall. And Beza out of the same verse vvwhich the Doctor hath alledged concludeth that in the primitive Kirk there vvvere materiall tables and not altars. The Chri-

q In 1 Cor. 8.

10. 1 Cor. 10.

27.

r disput de coena.

s In 1 Cor. 8.

10. Et 1 Cor.

10. 27.

t Synops. pag.

412.

Christians offended their weake Brethren by feasting on the things sacrificed in private houses, but in feasting in the temple there was both scandall and error. The Apostle findeth fault both with the one and the other. In a word all such metonymicall speeches do import the verity of the subject. The cup of the new Testament doth import that there was a materiall cup. To partake of the Altar, doth import that the Israelites had an Altar. I conclude with the ground laid down by Paræus, v from whatsoever rite the Sacrament is denominate, it is Sacramentall and necessarie. He inferreth that Sacramentall breaking of the bread after thanksgiving, is necessary to the integrity of the Sacrament: and I infer upon the same ground that a materiall table is necessary, seeing the Sacrament is denominate metonymically from a table, and called the table of the Lord, to distinguish it from other materiall tables.

V In 1 Cor. 11.  
A quo ritu totam Eucharistiam denominaverat ecclesia Apostolica is proculdubio est sacramentalis et necessarius.

His reason to prove kneeling more decent then sitting, is because it is a religious gesture, and more conform to other customes and fashions we use at the table of the Lord, which we use not at other tables. as we choose the day light rather then the night, a sacred place, such as is the temple a reverend order such as to receive before meat, because it is not a common supper, but the Lords supper. The answer is very easie: Are not all these circumstances and the same carriage observed for the hearing of the word, the day light, the sabbath day, the temple. Next all these customes are not in themselves simpliciter more decent: for in the time of persecution the night was as decent as the day, and a desert or a cave as decent as a Kirk: for expedience maketh decencie in these things. 3. In the primitive Kirk they communicated daily, and yet as decently as on the Sabbath day. 4. The Jewes were more tied to sacred times and temples for celebration of their Sacraments, and keeping of their feasts, then we are, and yet they sate even at the paschall supper, the noblest feast that they had. 5. None of these customes or circumstances do overthrow the table, and take away the right use of it, but kneeling taketh away the right use of the table, and turneth it into an altar or cup-board: but so doth not sitting. Whether is a gesture that maketh a table no table more decent for a table, or the gesture that preserveth the use of the Table

Sect. 2. and 3.



and all the rules of the feast? Our sitting applied to a holy purpose is sanctified for the time as all our actions are holy when they are done according to Gods will, and with a respect to his glory.

He sayth, that the gesture of the body is morall, voluntary, and changeable, and I should be applied according to the nature of the action. It is true, the gesture is changeable, according to that facultie in man which the Philotophers call *Locomotoriva*, but it is to be ordered by Lawes, both in civill and religious affaires.

VVe grant that our maniers and gestures must be composed according to the use of the table, and not according to the matter or form; but all table whatsoever be their matter, form and use, do require a table-gesture, never one doth admit kneeling. Men use not to kneele, no nor at the table of Exchange. The table of exchange doth differ in use from the table appointed for feasting, and therefore no wonder that they differ in the table gestures. But the table of the Lord agreeth with the feasting table in the analogicall use and end. Christ himselfe hath taught us how to use the Lords table, and with what gesture.

VVe are silent, we sport not, we take nothing before we are commanded and instructed at this table, as we do at other tables and feasts, because in so doing we should disturb that holy action; but sitting is so farre from disturbing, that it makes us more fit to attend to the commandement and instructions given us.

VVe sit with our heads vncovered at this table, which we do not at common tables, but we do it for veneration and not for adoration. VVe sit with our heads uncovered when the word is read, but not when it is preached, to distinguish between the voyce of God and the voyce of man. At this holy action the words, the symboles, the rites, are all divine; and Christs own words, rites, and symboles; his voyce foundeth through all the tables of the world: the symboles are the Princes seales, and our celebration is nothing else but a repetition of the first institution, and the authentike instrument written over again. VVe use not kneeling civilly, wheresoever we use the uncovered head; but kneeling is the gesture of adoration both in civill and religious uses. The uncovering of the  
head



head doth not spoyle us of the libertties and prerogatives of a table sociall admission to it, and familiar entertainment at it, nor breaketh not the order and frame of the institution, but kneeling is guiltie of all these enormities, as I have sayd.

If commodity make custome, and custome make decencie, Sect. 4. then kneeling must be condemned as an undecent gesture. The Doctor measureth the time of the celebration by his own form, when he dispatcheth the communicants with some few words, and not by the institution. But make the time of celebration never so short, yet kneeling is more painfull, then any other gesture, and consequently not so decent, because not so commodious. To what purpose serveth all this discourse, seeing kneeling is not urged as a table-gesture, but as a gesture of adoration. Swarez x sayth, that kneeling which is a note of adoration, may be made an act of a penitentie, for the pain which is joyned with it. But we consider not now the pain, but the purpose of it, in this argument. For never man yet thought that kneeling was the fittest table-gesture, neither have we ever heard any nation never so barbarous, use it.

He sayth kneeling is more universally received in the reformed Kirkes then sitting. If he meane of the Lutheran Kirkes, that universalitie is not to be regarded. The best reformed Kirkes as they have abandoned the opinion of the bodily presence, so have they the gesture of kneeling: yea all the Lutherans do not consent to the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist as Illyricus and his followers, because they say Christ is to be adored onely where it is his will to be adored. As for the Anglican Kirk, I deny that the body of that Kirk doth approve kneeling howsoever they be compelled by their Kirk representative to practise it. If we should follow examples, we must look to voluntaries.

It is no great commendation of kneeling, that it was practised 400 yeares under the Antichrist: and howbeit we wer not able to designe some time, when another gesture was in use, it will not follow, that it was in practise in all ages before. VVe are not bound to shew the beginning of every corruption. VVhilest the husband man was sleeping, the evill one did sow his tares among the wheat, which he perceived not, till they were grown up. Yet we will be more liberrall, and for further

x In Thomam  
tom. 1. pag.  
764. genuit.  
xio que est  
nota adora-  
tionis potest  
esse actus pe-  
nitentie pro-  
pter penalita-  
tem, quam ha-  
bet adjuncta.

† Morneus de

Eucharist. lib.

4. cap. 7. qua-

re Ecclesie

Orientalis

adotationem

Sacramenti

admiserunt

nuquam: non

que patriar-

che codstanti-

nopolitano

obsequuntur,

non quae An-

tiochen. Et

in Abyssinis

etiam ipsis

hodie stant

Sacramenta

participant

nec eo minus

reuerenter,

Sect. 3.

Sect. 6.

Pag. 39.

y Lib. 2. epist.

3. quod si nec

minima de

mandatis do-

minicis licet

soluere quan-

to magis tam

magna, tam

grandia, tam

ad ipsum do-

minice pas-

tionis, et no-

stre redemptio-

nis Sacramen-

um pertinen-

tia fas non est

lastringere.

ther satisfaction, we use to give an instance of an other gesture which was in use, to wit, standing at the act of receiving, for the space of 500. yea, an thousand yeare after Christ, and they cannot produce one expresse authentike testimony of kneeling for the space of 500 yea of a 1000 yeare after Christ. And to testifie ancient standing, we have yet the custome of Christians in the Orient. \*

Honorius it seemeth ordained not kneeling at the elevation of the Masse, but a reverend inclination of the body: howbeit aftervvard it turned to kneeling. But vvhether Honorius ordained kneeling at the elevation, and whether kneeling in the act of receiving went before kneeling at the elevation or followed after, is not prejudiciall to our cause. seeing both vvere bred under the Antichrist, and no authentick testimony can be alledged of the gesture of kneeling for a 1000. Yeares.

He admitteth standing on the Lords day, and other dayes, wherein they did not kneele in time of publick prayer: but yet upon other dayes saith he, as they might pray kneeling, so they might communicate kneeling. But he doth not produce so much as one example out of all antiquity. The examples alledged by us for standing in the act of receiving, are generall, and for every day as well as for the Lords day. The example alledged by himself doth not specifie any day. The testimony of Dionysius Alexandrinus, and the vvords of Tertullian are confounded in Perth assembly through the Printers fault, which by the vvay I vvish the Reader to mark.

The ancient Kirk changing sitting into standing; judged sitting not necessarie, It is true. Neither do we hold it absolutely necessarie, and as for the change vve are not to imitate them herein: for they adulterated the forme of the institution many wayes, mixing the vvine with water, giving the communion to Infants, taking the Sacrament home to eate it in their private houses, as may be seen in the most ancient vvriters. VVe ought to take heed, not vvhat any hath done before us, sayth Cyprian, but vvhat Christ vvho vvvas before all, did: vve must not follow the custome of man, but the truth of God,

God. And if it be not lawfull (sayth he) to break the least of the Lords commandements farre lesse is it lawfull to violate so great commandements belonging to the Sacrament of the Lords Passion, and of our redemption. Calvin z findeth great fault with them, and sayth, that the ancients went neerer the Iudaicall manner of sacrificing, then Christs ordinance, and the course of the Gospel wvould permit. And a little after he saith, that if vve think this supper the supper of the Lord, and not the supper of men, let us not move a naile bredth from it, for any authority of mē, or prescriptiō of yeares. And Tossanus saith, a that the changing of ceremonies in the Lord supper instituted by Christ, and heaping up of other ceremonies devised by mans vvill-vvorship, vvas the beginning of error anent the supper, and vvas no small occasion of superstition.

The ancient Kirk judged not standing the fittest gesture for prayer: for if they had so judged then they wvould have enjoined standing at prayer upon other dayes as vvell as upon the Lorde day. They stood on the Lords day, not becaule it vvas the fittest gesture for prayer, but for signification, to signifye their joy for Christs resurrection, but kneeling they judged the fittest gesture for prayer, as may be seen in the questions attributed to Iustinus. b The ancient Kirk standing at the receit of the Sacrament, ye see then, judged not the gesture of prayer, the fittest gesture in the act of receiving the Sacrament.

z Institut. lib 4. c. 18. sect. 12.

a Orat. de coena domini. principium erroris circa coenam domini, nec minima superstitionis occasio proculdubio fuit, immutatio ceremoniarum a Christo institutarum, et accumulatio illarum, quas humana successu temporis excogitavit.

b quest. 115. Genuum inclinatio in precatione magis peccatores deo commendat, quam si stantes orer.

## CHAP. III.

*Kneeling agreeth not best  
with pietie.*

**T**He Doctor will now prove kneeling to agree best with pietie. But if it agree not best with the decencie of a table, but overthroweth the right use of it how shall it agree best with pietie. That gesture agreeth best with pietie, that agreeth best with the order and rules of the institution. For he cannot be devout sayth Ambrose <sup>c</sup> who presumeth to do otherwaile, then the author hath set down.

<sup>c</sup> In 1 Cor. II.

Seet. 1. 2. 3. 4.

d De Eucharist pag. 575.  
576.

<sup>e</sup> In numer.

homil. 23. hoc

quodmodolo-

quimur, sunt

carnes Christi.

f In numer.

homil. 16.

g In psal. 147

Licet in my-

sterio possit

intelligi, ta-

men verius

corpus Christi

et sanguis ejus

sermo scriptu-

rum est.

The consideration of the giver the gift, the manner of donation, and receiving is not plainly set down by the doctor. The name of gift is ambiguous, as may be seen in Casaubonus. <sup>d</sup> For the Fathers sometime called the inward grace of the Sacrament the gift, and sometimes the symbollicall part, and sometimes they called it the gitt, & somtimes giftes. If we were to receive a gift, if it were both a morcell of bread out of gods own hand immediatly, we ought, no doubt to adore, and so his similitude of a subject receiving a benefit out of the princes own hand, may illustrat the matter very well. But at the Lords supper we receive the elements of bread and wine not out of gods own hands immediatly, but out of the hands of the Minister, who is our fellow-servant. 2. Our union with Christ, & participation of his body and blood is not begun at the Lords supper nether is it proper to it, but common to the word and to baptisme. By the ministerie of the word, and the Sacrament of Baptisme, we are made partakers of Christ and his benefites if we have the hand of faith to receive. Origen sayth, <sup>e</sup> that which we are presently speaking to you is the flesh of Christ. And in another place, <sup>f</sup> we are sayd to drinke the blood of Christ not ouely by the rites of the Sacraments, but also when we heare the word. And Hierome sayth <sup>g</sup> howbeit the words of Christ

of Christ to eate his flesh and drinke his blood, may be understood in the mysterie, yet more truly the speech of the scriptures is the body and blood of Christ. Augustinus sayth, <sup>h</sup> there is no doubt but every one of the faithfull is made partaker of the body and blood of Christ, when in Baptisme he is made a member of Christ. Chrysostome sayth, <sup>i</sup> that in Baptisme we adore the body of Christ. VVe receive then the very same benefits in the word and Baptisme which we receive in the Lords supper. Our union with Christ is begun by faith; faith is wrought by the ministry of the word, and confirmed afterward by the same word, and strengthened also by the ministry of the Sacraments, which are seales and pledges to us of our union with Christ. 3. These benefites are common to the Sacraments of the old Law and the new: they had the same substance of the seales that we have, did eate the same spirituall food, and drinke the same spirituall drink that we do, <sup>1</sup> Cor. 10. 3. 4. Augustine saith <sup>h</sup> that whosoever in the Manna understood Christ, did eate the same spirituall meat that we do. And yet the people of God in gathering the manna, howbeit not ministred to them by the hand of men, did not kneele. The Paschall Lamb was the same to the people of God, that the Lords supper is to us, and yet they sate at the Paschal supper. 4. The inward grace is not given to all the communicants, but to the godly onely; neither do the godly ever find comfort at the instant of receiving the seale. Then according to the Doctors own words, the action of donation not being perceived at the instant, it is then to be acknowledged with thanksgiving when it is felt afterward. But all the communicants participate of the Sacrament, even the wicked. Now the Lord in setting down the order of the institution, had respect to the Sacramentall manner of donation, which is common to all; and not to the spirituall which is proper to fevv. Even the very wicked eate the body and blood of Christ Sacramentally: and when the godly eate spiritually, yet they participate not pure spiritualiter, as Cajetane <sup>1</sup> speaketh, meerey spiritually, but Spiritualiter & Sacramentaliter. And this manner of donation with solemne testification, which is not purely spirituall, but spirituall and sacramentall is common to the godly both under the Law and under the Gospell, & to Baptisme, allweill as the Lords supper.

<sup>h</sup> Epistola ad Bonifacium.

<sup>i</sup> In Marcum homil. 14.

<sup>h</sup> De utilitate penitent. cap. 1. quicunque in manna intellexerunt Christum eundem quem nos spiritualement cibum manducaverunt.

<sup>1</sup> In 3 quest. 79. 80.

The Apostle 1 Cor. 11. condemneth all manner of unworthy receiving, whether by hypocrisie, when we come without faith and repentance: or by prophannes, when we come like drunkards and factiously. But sitting the Apostle did never condemne, but rather approved as the ordinary table-gesture. The wicked, howbeit they partake not spiritually of the Lords body, yet they are guiltie in respect of abusing the seales, as Chrysostome sayth, he that polluteth the Princes purple robe offendeth the Prince himselfe.

As for our manner of receiving, the common manner is sacramentall, and according to that which is common to all should our carriage be. The Godly receive also with faith spiritually, but as I have sayd not purely spiritually, but Spiritually and Sacramentally. Faith is accompanied with humility, it is true; but humilitie is an habit of the Soule, and not an act of adoration. Faith is accompanied with hunger and thirst, it is true; but hunger and thirst is not the prayer of the Soule, but a provoker of the soule to pray, as hunger and thirst provoketh a man to cry for meat and drink. Faith is accompanied with joy, and joy resolueth in desires, it is true; but desires are not formallie prayers and praises. Faith is accompanied with all other Christian graces: For every Christian grace is accompanied with the rest. But this concomitance of the habits of other graces, which is all times in a Christian, doth not import their actuall vvorking at all times. Faith is the chiefe vvorker in the act of receiving: the rest do assist, if there be need; but ought not hinder the meditation and application of faith. VVhen there do arise any short ejaculations of prayer or praise, they are onely occasionall as the communicant doth find himselfe disposed, and Faith for to vvork. Next, they are subtile and swift, that there is not that agility in our hompish bodies, as to follow with our gestures these swift motions, ending perchance in twinkling of an eye. Thirdly, they are secret between God and the Soule, & therefore ought to be concealed rather then expressed by gestures of vvorship. In a word, seeing the manner of our receaving is not purely spirituall, but spirituall and Sacramentall, the spirituall must not disorder the Sacramentall manner set down by him that is the instituter. VVe are bound to heare the word vvith Faith,



Faith, and Faith must be accompanied with humilitie, and other Christians graces. There vvill arise also from hunger, thirst, joy, desires, vvishes, mentall ejaculations of playe and praise; but the hearer must not for all that cease from hearing, and fall dovvn to vvorship. Is there any thing here required, but the like vvvas required under the Sacraments of the old Law, and is required at the hearing of the vvord.

The secret and hid covenaut, made betwixt God and Man, is made at the time of effectuall calling. The first solemnization of it, is made at our entrie in the bosome of the Kirke, vvhen vve make personall profession on our part, and the Minister in Gods name admitteth us, as the mouth of the congregation. This is sealed by Baptisme. Thereafter the vvord preached to all the members of the congregation, is presumed to be delivered to beleevvers and penitent persons, and Faith and repentance is presupposed into the hearers, vvhen the promises of the Gospel are made unto them. So that after their first entry, Faith is presumed in the hearer, as vvell as in the communicant. Next, the Sacramentall vvord is generall, as the vvord Preached is. This is my Body vvhich is broken for you. This is the new Testament of my blood, vvhich is shed for the remissions of the sins of many. It is not delivered in the singular number, for thee Peter, or thee Paul, no more then then the vvord preached. The seales and elements are received severally, and the Spirit vvorketh severally. The word is uttered generally, as the Sacramentall word is, but the Spirit vvorketh by it severally. If a man should kneele for the severall vvork of the Spirit, then he must kneele, as vvell at the vvord as at the Sacrament. As for the severall receiving of the seale, it is so received severally, at that it must also be received conjunctly, vvith other communicants, that is: that the communicants sitting at one table, communicate together, and distribute among themselves. The severall receiving of the outward seales, must not break the order of conjunct receiving, & communicating enjoyed by Christ, & an actuall remembrance of Christs death & passion, must not burst forth in vocall thanksgiving in the very act of receiving. That as the communicating was conjunct, so the thanksgiving may be common,



and that the conjunct communicating be not intertubed, VVhen the history of the Passion is read, we are in actuall remembrance of Christs death, but we burst not out in vocall praises. VVhen the seale is received, it is received from the hand of men, and it is no more but the outward seale, grace is not inclosed in it as a plaister in a box, or liquor into a vessel. The kirk in the time of Novatus, was gone frō the right form of administration, and therefore their example is no good argument to prove severall thanks giving. And we read of nothing, that was answered then by the cōmunicants, but Amē. He that delivered sayd, The body of the Lord: he that received, sayd Amen. Novatus vvhen he delivered, sayd these words to the communicant, Swear to me by the body of the Lord, that thou wilt not return to Cornelius, instead of these words the body of the Lord; and likewise the receiver answered, in place of Amen, I will not return to Cornelius. <sup>m</sup> Now for a custome of saying Amen at the receiving, as a particle of confirmation of the words uttered by the Minister, to wit, the body of the Lord, vve cannot conclude kneeling; for they sayd Amen standing. But as I sayd before, we are not to look to the formes of the anciēt kirk. For the very Papists themselves have thought shame of some of them, and the posterior ages abolished many of them. Let it be remembered here also, that all the D. discourse may be applied to the Sacraments of the old Law, as well as of the new. For there in their Sacraments the covenant was solemnized, and they received the seales, and actuall remembrance of the benefits received, and to be received was required, but kneeling was not required. The comparing of the Sacraments of the old Law and new Law, and of the word of God with the Sacraments, together with the order of the institution, may furnish answers to al the Doctors arguments.

This Sacrament is called the Lords supper, partly for honor of the first institution, partly to poynt out to us the liberalitie of the spirituall supper, as suppers were more liberall then dinners of old. The spirituall part is called a Feast or supper metaphorically, & it is resembled by the symbolical part. It was not necessarie, that the symbolical part should be like cōmon Feasts or suppers in all poynts. There are as many poynts in it, as may serve to resemble the spirituall supper. To which sym-

an Baronius  
anno 57. numero 146. Et  
anno 254. numero 75. Bel-  
Jarminus de  
eucharistia,  
lib. 4. c. 13.

Secl. 8.

symbolicall representation of a supper, a table-gesture and specially sitting was most correspondent and agreeable, and so Christ and his Apostles used it. Piscator sayth,<sup>n</sup> it is evident in that the disciples did eat of the bread, and drink of the cup sitting together at table, that this action had (*speciem convivij*), the shew or semblance of a banquet: yea, that it was a banquet indeed, but a sacred one. And Mornæus sayth,<sup>o</sup> the like. It is true, the Doctor sayth the name of supper should not diminish the estimation of it: but on the other side say I, no ceremonies should be brought in to take away *speciem convivij* the semblance of a banquet or supper; but when the communicants receive severally kneeling, as if there were no table not onely is that semblance of a banquet or supper, which the Lord instituted taken away, but all forme of banquet or Supper, that ever was used in any part of the world. As for the giving and receiving at this supper, we have spoken already.

<sup>n</sup> In Math. 26.  
26. Pag. 737.

<sup>o</sup> De eucharist. lib. 4. c. 7.  
mitto sacram  
coenam olim  
convivij in-  
stat in quo  
discumbeba-  
tur celebra-  
tam, cujus et-  
iamnum in  
Benedictino-  
rum mandato  
vestigium.

The washing of the Disciples feet, and Christ his sitting at table, are not rightly matched together. His washing of their feet before the last service of the Paschall supper was an extraordinarie example to teach his Disciples humilitie, but his sitting at table, was not a thing extraordinary, but ordinary & usuall. He sate with them at the Paschal suppers before according to the custome of the sacred Feast, and not to teach them humilitie: so did he at the Eucharisticall supper.

Sect. 9.

We never reasoned after this manner, The Apostles sate at table with Christ, therefore we may sit now with Christ. Christ is not bodily present now, that we may sit with him. To ask if we would sit at table, suppose Christ glorified would come down from heaven and sit with us, were a question not worthy scanning. But we reason after this manner, when Christ was bodily present, the Apostles kneeled not, but sate at table; farre lesse when he is not bodily present should we kneele.

That he was then in the state of a servant, will not help their cause. For howbeit he was in the state of a Servant, yet upon singular occasions he was adored. If I would discourse Rhetorically upon the present occasion they had to move them to kneele, then any man would grant that the occasion of adoration was singular, and yet they kneeled not, for other weightie reasons and causes. It is also untrue, that the Doctor sayth,

that he carried at this time onely the forme of a Servant, and Minister of the externall element, for he carried also in open view, the person of a Lord, in that he did institute the Sacrament.

VVe yet reason further from the example of Christ and his Apostles, not respecting adoration directed to Christ bodily present, and we say that Christ directed not his Apostles to adore and worship God the Father for the benefit of redemption, when they were in the act of receiving. Christs familiar presence should not have withholden them from directing their prayers and praises to God, if it had been a thing requisite, no more then when they kneeled in their prayers to God at other times, no doubt notwithstanding of Christs familiar presence in the carriage of a Servant. And Christ should have taught them so to do, if the reasons hitherto alledged by the Doctor were good. All his reasons are as good for the first supper as for the rest of the rest of the suppers which have followed since. The words of the institution served to teach the Apostles, as well as us, that he was their benefactor, testator, adopter, redeemer, and feeder.

Again, the form that Christ instituted, he appointed it not for that night onely, but to be observed to his comming again, & therefore the different state of Christ in humility or glory, did not alter it. And even after his ascension, when he was in the state of glorie, the Apostolicall Kirkes as we have sayd, sate at table. The rules of the institution and precepts generall & particular, admit no other gesture, but a table-gesture. Seeing these rules & precept are perpetuall & to be observed, whether Christ be in the state of glorie or humilitie, it is evident, that it was Christs will, that after his glorificatiō also, we should continue the table-gesture, and the semblance of a supper till his comming again, when we shall sup with him in glorie.

VVhen the Apostle saith, Shew forth the Lord death, till he come again; the Doctor saith, he meaneth not verball preaching made by word, but reall preaching acted by taking, eating, drinking. This is a Iesuiticall exposition very familiar with the Doctor throughout his book. The Rhemists so expound the words, 1 Cor. 11. 26. that this commemoration is nothing els but the representation of the death of Christ made by the elements & the action, But D. Fulk answereth that even

accor-

according to the judgement of the Fathers, the Lords death must be shewed not onely by the action, but also by words that may stirre us up to remembrance and thankfulness. Although saith he a long sermon as we take a sermon, is not necessarie, yet at least a summarie and brieve declaration of the institution and use of the Sacrament, is necessarie. And therefore saith V Villets, <sup>p</sup> the Sacraments cannot rightly be Ministered, unles there be a declaratiō & shewing forth of the Lords death, not onely in the visible action of breaking, distributing, but also in setting forth the end of the Lords death, with an exhortatiō to thankfulness. Pezelius saith, <sup>q</sup> that to annunce or declare, is not to expresse by similitude of fact, but to inculcate the death of Christ & his benefites, & to teach the right use of the Sacramēt. This annunciatiō agreeth with the Hagadah, that is the declaratiō, which was made at the passover, according to the cōmandement, Exo. 13. 8. & thou shalt shew. This precept was giue not to be performed cōfusedly by al, but according to good order & comelines, & therefore at the paschall supper one made the declaration, expounding every coremony, in the own place; the meaninge of the Lamb, of the bitter hearbs, & so forth of the rest. This hagadah & declaratiō of the Iewes, saith Casaubonus, answereth to annunciate, 1 Cor. 11. 26.

<sup>p</sup> Of the sacrament. quest. 1.

<sup>q</sup> Refutatio Catechismi Jesuitarum. P. 421.

But admitting the Doctors interpretation, what would he inferre? He would inferre that this Sacrament is called Eucharist not onely for the thanksgiving, wherewith it beginneth & endeth, but because the action it selfe is an actiō of thanksgiving. for as it is a memoriall of his praise, so it is a testimonie of our thankfulness. It is true indeed that the name of Eucharist is attributed, not by scripture, but by the Fathers to the action, yea to the elements themselves. But it is improper appellation to call the bread of the Sacrament Eucharist, that is thanksgiving. And therefore Iustinus <sup>s</sup> calling it so, must expound it again by more proper speech, saying panis Eucharistæ theis, the bread wherupon thanksgiving was made, so likewise the action of giving, receiving, eating, drinking, if at any time they be called Eucharisticall, it is improper speech; For properly thanksgiving standeth in words, and no other but verball thanksgiving is properly Eucharistia. And from that which is properly thanksgiving, it should seeme most reasonable that the vvhole action is denominated Eucharist

<sup>r</sup> Exercitaz. Pag. 324.

<sup>s</sup> Apolog. 1.

Exercitat.  
p. 117. Eulogia  
et Eucharistia  
utraque vox a  
parte una to-  
tam domini  
actionem des-  
ignat.

or thanksgiving. And Casaubonus saith, that the Sacrament is denominated both Eulogia, and Eucharistia from a part of the action, to wit, the proper thanksgiving and blessing.

u Contra  
Julianum  
Lib. 4.

The actions are properly a representation, and consequently a memoriall of Christs death and Passion; but not properly a commemoration of his death and Passion. VVhen verball commemoration is made, of Christs death and Passion it is not formally, a rendring of thanks: farr lesse is the representation. VVe kneele not when verball commemoration is made of Christs Passion; should we kneele at the representation. The Iewish passover was to the People of God a memoriall of their by-past deliverance, and a type of the spirituall deliverance to come, yet neither for the action, nor nor for the declaration made at the action did they kneele. To divine worship, sayth Cyrillus, belong sacrifices, hymnes, prayers, praises, and thanksgivings, adoration and worship, sacred devotions, priesthood, temples, altars, offrings, confessions, solemnities. VVhere ye may see thanksgiving and adoration are distinguished from the rest. All these particulars belong to Gods honour ingenerall, but they are not adoration or praise in particular: honor is more generall then praise or adoration. He that adoreth, honoreth; but every one that honoreth, adoreth not. The last Section containeth a conclusion of his former discourses, which are answered.

C H A P. IV.

*Kneeling standeth not  
with Charitie.*

**O**F the gift, the giver, the manner of donation, and receiving, and of the requisites of Faith, hunger, thirst, joy, humilitie in the communicants, vve spake before. Section 1.

The Pastor ministring the externall element, representeth Sect. 2, 3, 4. Christ, ministring the spirituall food to the soule. Our sitting at table, and communicating with the pastor doth resemble the soule admitted to the spirituall table, and Christ dining and supping with it, Apocalypsis. 3. 20. Eating and drincking represent our union with Christ, as food to our soules, but do not represent our fellowship with him, as of guests with the master of the Feast. This is represented by a Table-gesture. VVhen I eate a great mans meat set before me, or reached to me, his meat is united to me, and turned in the substance of my body, and that may be done without a table, wheresoever I eate his meate. But when he admitteth me to sit at his table, he maketh manifest the fellowship, whereunto he hath assured me at that time. Vnion is one thing, and societie and fellowship is another thing. The Doctor therefore reasoneth not well, from eating and drincking against the table-gesture.

VVhen we speake of fellowship with Christ, at the spirituall table, we do not so much as dreame of equalitie, no more then David and Jonathan thought themselves equall to Saul, when they sate at his table, or lame Mephiboseth to David, when he eate at his table.

As for standing of the communicants in ancient time, vve say it did not so well expresse this fellowship as sitting. As for kneeling, it altogether obscureth it.

Our union likewise among our selves in one body, it is true,  
as the



as the Doctor saith, is sufficiently expressed by partaking of one bread: but our fellowship amongst our selves as guests at one table, is expressed by communicating the elements one with another, and consequently with a table gesture. The eating of the guests feeding upon one meat, is one thing, for that may be done apart: and eating together at one table, distributing each to other is another thing. The communicants are considered diversly: sometimes as members of one body, feeding upon the selfe-same food: so sometimes as several guests feeding together at one table, and exchanging tokens of amitie amongst them selves. The first is union, the second is fellowship. This fellowship is not onely obscured, but taken away by kneeling and onely preserved by a table gesture.

The Apostle 1 Corinth. 10. 17. doth mean Sacramentall communion of these who in one congregation eate together did eate of one Sacramentall bread, and not of the generall communion, which all the members of Christs body, where soever they be, have one with another. They who are joynd together by Sacramentall communion, have their spirituall communion also with the whole Kirke, sealed by this Sacramentall communion. The ancients did understand the Apostle to speake of one Sacramentall bread; and therefore in some places and times they had but one Sacramentall bread indeed, to expresse the communion of the saints the more vively. Durandus sayeth, In the primitive Kirk, they offered one great bread sufficient for all which custom the Grecians are sayd yet to observe. And Honorius Augustodunensis saith, that of old the Priests tooke floore out of every house and family, which the Grecians yet observe, whereof they make one bread which they distribute. Dionysius Areopagita, Ignatius, & Anselmus make mention likewise of one bread, and of one cup. Moulin<sup>a</sup> reporteth out of Franciscus Alvarez, that the Abyssins make a great Bunne, about a finger thick, wherein the Priest maketh five holes with his finger, in remembrance of the five woundes of Christ, and this he doth consecrate in the Arabian tongue.

<sup>t</sup> Lib. 4. ca. 53.

<sup>u</sup> In Gemma animae cap. 58.

<sup>x</sup> Ecclesi. hierarch. cap. 5.

<sup>y</sup> Ad philadelph.

<sup>z</sup> In 1 Cor. 10.

<sup>a</sup> Of the Lords Supper, 2.

part. pag. 15.

Sect. 5.

He sayth that all the significant ceremonies and actions, that belong to the nature of the Sacrament, are employed about the elements, or to the use of them onely. If therefore a table gesture be a Sacramentall ceremony, the table whereunto

the



the use of the gesture belongeth must also be the third sym-  
bole or signe representing Christ, and consequently as ne-  
cessarie, and essentiall, as bread and wine; and the gesture as  
necessarie, as eating and drinking. VVe answer, first, there is  
no necessitie, that euery ceremonie and rite be significant. for  
some may be ceremonies of order onely, yet serving to the right  
ministration of the Sacrament, that with out them the Sacra-  
ment can not be rightly administred, nor the order and frame  
thereof due observed; the they are necessarie, suppose they  
haue no signification. But we haue demonstrated already, that  
kneeling putteth al out of joynt, and a table-gesture onely doth  
keep the institution in order as Christ hath commanded. Next,  
the table-gesture is employed about the elements themselues;  
for it is not employed about a bare table, but a table with the  
elements set thereon, & for the elements. 3. Euery significant  
ceremonie, is not of like necessitie. The breaking of bread after  
thanksgiuing, is a significant ceremonie & necessarie for the  
integritie & right ministration of the Sacrament, yet it is not  
equal with eating & drinking: which is necessarie to the essence  
of that actiō. VVhat reason therefore is there to make a table  
and table-gesture suppose they be significant, as necessarie as  
bread and wine, eating and drinking. 4. As for the signifi-  
cation of a table and table-gesture, vve admit not strange alle-  
gories, as to signifie the accomplishment of the ceremonies of  
the Law in Christ, yet such significations as arise of the proper  
use and end of table-gestures at ordinarie banquets we allow.  
The guests sit at ordinarie tables, appointed for ordinarie feasts,  
with great personages, partly for ease, partly to signifie their fa-  
miliar admission to their tables, and sociall entertainment there-  
at. Sitting is the ordinarie table-gesture chosen for these  
respects. Our sitting at the Symbolicall part of this feast, re-  
presenteth the soule sitting with ease, and familiarly admitted  
by Christ to the spirituall feast. This signification is expres-  
sed in metaphoricall speeches and parables by Christ himselve,  
when he saith, many shall come from the east and from the  
west, and sit at table in the Kingdom of heauen with A-  
BRAHAM, ISAAC and IACOB, Math. 8. 11.  
And LAZARVS is brought, in Luke 16. 23. sitting at  
that heavenly table nere to ABRAHAM, leaning on  
his hosom.

b De Iub.  
apocryphis.  
P. 942.  
c Tom. 4. Lib.  
3 c. 12.

d Orat. 13.  
Post reditum.

As Iohn was neereſt Chriſt at the Paſchall ſupper, when he leant in his boſome, that is, was neereſt his boſome. For the ſecond was neereſt the firſt, and the third neereſt the ſeconds boſome, who were in one bed. By one Lazarus is expreſſed the happieſtate of all Gods Children, they ſhall be ſo deere to Abraham, as if everie one ſhould ſit neereſt to him at his boſome in heaven. See Beza in Luke 16, and Reynolds Centuria b and Baradius c. Seeing our reſpoſe and familiar entertainment at the heavenly table, is expreſſed by ſitting, the reſpoſe & familiar entertainment at the ſpirituall table, whereof that is an accompliſhment, is very fitly reſembled by ſitting at the communion table. Chriſt ſignified ſo much before he aroſe from the ſupper Luk. 22. 30. I have appoynted to you a Kingdome that ye may eate and drinke at my table in my Kingdome, and ſit on ſeats, and judge the 12 tribes of Iſrael. The Fathers in calling it a myſticall table, do underſtand that there is a ſpirituall table answerable to it. Nazianzen ſaith, d that howbeit they thruſt him from the altars, meaning the Lords tables, yet he knew another altar, whereof theſe were onely examplars, he will ſtand at that altar or table. Is it not our common cuſtome to put the communicants in minde of another table, whereat the ſoule is to feed ſpirituallly? If the table be myſticall, why may not the table-gesture be myſticall. Now ſitting expreſſeth this ſignification very well, ſtanding not ſo well; kneeling nor at all.

VVe require not ever of neceſſitie, to the right miniſtration of the Sacrament an artificiall table made of timber, but the form of a table vve require, vvhatſoever the matter be; timber or ſtone, or a peece of ground. As Mark. 6. vvhere the multitude ſate in rowes by fifties and fifties upon the ground to eate of the loaves; that peece of ground, vvhereabout they ſate, vv as the form of a table, howbeit the matter vv as earth. So if the Turkes vv ere converted, and did communicate after the ſame forme, ſitting on the ground in companies with their feet and legs pleit, the dimension and ſhape of the ground, whereabout they ſit, is their table, & their ſitting their table-gesture. For the high table and the table on the ground, answer analogically one to the other. This kind of table and table-gesture, preſerveth the vv hole order of the institution. For ſitting in this manner, the communicants may diſtribute the elements among

among theſelves. The like we may ſay of the times of perfecution, where the artificiall table cannot be had, there the natural is ſufficient. There is no diuers faſhion of nations, taketh away the form of a table, nor no different ſtate of time prosperous or troubleſome. VVine is one of the elements inſtituted by Chriſt to be a ſigne of his blood: but what if the communion were celebrated in parts, wher there is no vvine to be gotten, nor bread made of wheat, but of the rootes of hearbes; may they not uſe ſuch things as they have, which come neereſt to the uſe of our bread and wine? Calvin ſayth they may, and Beza approveth his judgement; \* for they are to other Symbola c Epist. 1. f. analoga ſaith he.

The Doctör ſaith, there is no other table-gesture, neceſſarie, but that which the Apoſtle calleth Metechein to participate of the table by eating and drinking, as onely preſcribed in the inſtitution. But we have already ſayd, that there is ſuch an order of the inſtitution preſcribed, as will not admit every kind of participation, but ſuch as may ſtand with the rules and precepts of the inſtitution, that is, with do this, and divide it among you. And therefore participation with the gesture of kneeling, is excluded. If to participate onely be required, then let us take it by the mouth, and not by the hand, for greater reverence. As for feare of ſuperſtition the Doctör will free us of that; we are ſo well informed againſt tranſubſtantiation, and the bodily preſence.

He ſayth all nations agree not in one forme of Table-gesture. VVhat then? do they not all agree in a table-gesture? And as for kneeling, no nation under the cope of heaven did ever uſe it for a table-gesture. Further, it is urged, not as the moſt decent table-gesture, but as a gesture of adoration.

To receive the Sacrament upon the Sabbath day after meat Sect. 6. and vvith uncovered heads, is not to be compared with receiving kneeling. In the former vve ſymbolize vvith the pure Kirk, and have ſufficient vvarrant from the word. In the laſt vvith the Roman Kirk, and have no vvarrant ſo to doe.

VVe received not the gesture of ſitting from the Arrians, but from the firſt primitive and Apoſtolicall Kirk, and Chriſts example: therefore we cannot be ſayd to ſymblyze vvith Arrians.

Arrians. The 4 conclusion of Synodus Petricoviensis, cited by the Doctor, alledgeth, that sitting at table is no where uted in Europe, which is false. For when that Synod was holden anno 1578. sitting at table was in use in the Kirkes of Scotland, and the Low Countries and is yet still in use among them. That Synod consisted of fundrie sortes of protestants, some adhering to the Augustane Confession, some to the confession of Bohemia, some to the Confession of Helvetia, The Lutherans would not consent to sitting, because of the bodily presence: others adhering to the Helvetian confession, would not consent to kneeling; therefore that they might agree, it was permitted to every one to stand, or kneele. And so not onely for dispite of the Arrians or (as Synodus Cracoviensis calleth them) Arrianabaptists, did they discharge sitting: But also for their respects of common agreement among themselves. VVe are not to follow the Canons of such confused Synods. Yet I vvish the Doctor had set down the words immediately preceeding, where they say, & that it is neither the vvill of God, nor the custome of the purer Kirk, to smite men with Ecclesiasticall discipline for externall rites, and therefore permitteth every man to stand or kneele. Yee see the Lutherans notwithstanding of their opinion of the reall presence are not so hot for kneeling as our men, who outwardly professe othervvayes. This Synod would not have allowed office-men to be compelled to kneele under the pain of deprivation from their offices, whereunto they have right of their life rent, by the Lawes of the Land, and wherein ther livelihood doth stand. This mixt Synod would not have allowed our two pretended Archbishops Mr. Spottiswood, and Mr. Law to sit in the court of high commission, where they sit without allowance of the Kirk and the States, and to exerce like Popes the power of both the Swords, suspending, depriving, fining, confining, and imprisoning. First they delate, and then they execute, as Doeg did. That mixt Synod would not have allowed the foure Ministers of Edinburgh aboue-named to incense his Majestie against the people with their calumnious and sycophanticall letters. Mr. Galloway professed openly in pulpit, that he would do good service to God, who vvould procure their punishment. Mr. Struthers declaimed against them, because they were not so pliable

f qua quidem  
propter exter-  
nos ritus ho-  
mines pios se-  
rire, neque est  
domini vo-  
luntas, neque  
purioris Ec-  
clesiae mos.

pliable to his course, as he desired. Al the foure presse to extinguish that spark of light & zeale yet remaining with the better sort; which was kindled by those worthies, who went before the, shining as burning lampes, Mr. Knox, Mr. Lowis, Mr. Bruce, &c

It were strange if Calvin I should be a faviour of kneeling, whose doctrine and perpetuall practise was against it. In the place alledged by the Doctor, he preferreth adoration in the supper before adoration in the streets, when the bread is carried in pompe or procession: he doth not allow it simpler in the supper. His words are generall, and may be applied to any part of the supper, as well as to the act of receiving, and to internall adoration as well as to externall. He recalleth us to the institution in the same section, and in the words which I haue cited before, as the surest warrant for our conscience, where he saith, the Apostles in the institution, and the Apostollicall Kirkes afterward, kneeled not.

Sect. 7.

Page.

P. Martyr, wrote his treatise of the Eucharist, when he was Professor in Oxford, not many yeares after he had forsaken papistry. Crammer, his speciall friend, Ridley and others who saw not all things in the dawning of the day, being moved with the stirres and out-cries of the papists, to appease them some what, enjoyed kneeling in the act of receiving, in the renewing of the booke of common prayer. P. Martyr, a stranger was loath to contradict his great friends, & the received order; or it may be that the he saw no further, his reason is very weak: for many do kneele devoutly sayth he, when they heare these words read; And the word was made flesh. What was this, but to confirm one superstition with another? for wherefore should we kneele at these words more then at the rest of the articles of our faith, or comfortable passages of scripture? VVhen he was afterward in Zurich writing against Gardiner, he was forced to defend his former treatise, & through the importunitie of his aduersarie, he was driuen to utter such speeches. As the papists worship their absent Saints in their images so doe worship Christs body being absent in the sacrament. And again, as the nobles & Citizens reuerence the Emperour in his purple robe & his seale, howbeit they know he is not contained in them: so doe we in the Sacrament worship Christs body being absent. Yet this much we may perceiue, that he could never throughly digest it, for in the same part vvhich the Doctor doth cite him: he doth twice wish that all kinde of externall adoration

Page. 62. 176.  
177.

Page. 67.



adoration were abolished, whether prostration of the body, or kneeling. And when he was in Zurich, In his defence against Gardiner, he affirmeth plainly, that it was without any warrant of Gods word, yea against the example of Christ and his Apostles. But not willing to insist long in scanning mens testimonies, I proceed.

Section 8.

VVe compare not the brasen Serpent with the bread in the Sacrament. It is the ordinance of God, and of perpetuall use even to his coming againe, according to Christs commandement, howbeit the Papists have made an Idol of it. The ordinances of God should not be abolished when they are abused & polluted by men, but ought onely to be restored to their right use. VVe compare the brasen Serpent with kneeling in the act of receiving. If Ezekias brake in peeces the brasen Serpent, which was reserved for 700 yeares as a monument of Gods mercie, because it was polluted with Idolatrie: Farre more should kneeling in the act of receiving, be abolished; seeing it is but the invention of man, and hath been abused to the vilest Idolatrie that ever was, the worship of the bready God. The brasen Serpent had no state in the worship of God, and yet Ezekias would not be curious in the carefull keeping of it, but brake it in peeces. Kneeling hath state in the worship of God, and cannot be hid from the eyes of men, therefore more dangerous then the brasen Serpent. Constantine the great closed up the temples of Idols, Iulian opened them againe: therefore Theodosius demolished them.

Sec. 9.

It is true the Doctor saith, that there is great difference betwixt an Image, and the workes of God, the word and the Sacraments. But yet it is Idolatrie to give Gods worship to any creature whatsoever, suppose to an Angell of heaven. It is lawfull to bow down if there be not some other just impediment, when we have seen the workes of God, when we have heard the word, received the Sacraments, &c. But the Doctor frameth his words after this manner: To bow down when we have seen the workes of God, when we have heard the word, when we receive the Sacraments: he sayth not when we have received as he sayd of the other two, and as he should have done. Or else if he had spoken to his purpose, he should have said after this manner: It is lawfull to bow down when we see



vve see the workes of God, heare the word, or receive the Sacraments, which he vvould be loath to do.

He doth the like in the two examples following, vvhen the fire fell down and consumed the sacrifice of Elias, the people fell on their faces and cried the Lord is God. And the infidell, or unlearned Christian, convinced by the Prophets in his conscience falling on his face, adored God saying, God is among you. Here the Principall cause of their falling down vvas God, faith he, but the miraculous vvork of the fire, and the word of the Prophets, vvhereby they were instrumentall causes vvhereby they were vvakened and stirred up. Even so vvhen vve fall dovvn at the Sacrament, the principall cause that mooveth us (sayth he) is God to vvhom vve kneele, but the Sacrament is the instrument, vvhereby vve are taught, and admonished to fall dovvn at that time, and in that place. If the Doctor had said of the first tvo, that at the same time, and in the same place they fell dovvn also, he had said to the purpose. But he doth altogether suppress the circumstance of time and place in the tvo examples. And the truth is, that the people fell on their faces, after that the fire had consumed the burnt-offring, and the vvood, and the stones, and the dust, and licked up the vvater that vvvas in the ditch, 1 King. 18. 38. 39. And the infidell, or unlearned Christian is brought in (upon supposition in case such a thing fall out) falling on his face, and adoring God after that the Prophets had ended their Prophecying. For he is brought in speaking, vvwhich could not be done vvithout confusion, if the Prophets vvwere prophecying in the meane time. So his examples do not serve his purpose, nor his comparison in generall of the Sacraments vvith the vvord & vvorkes of God. For if vve should fall dovvn at the time and place vvhen vve see the vvorkes of God, and feele our selves vvakened and stirred up by them, then shall vve fall dovvn before the vvhole host of heaven, and every thing that creepeth on the earth. Or vvhen vve heare the vvord, if every man as he findeth himselfe vvakened and stirred up, should fall dovvn and vvorship, howvbeir he joyn not speaking vvith it, like the infidell, or unlearned, vvhat a confusion vvould be brought into Gods service? Next I say, suppose it vvwere granted that the people fell dovvn in the meane time that the fire vvvas vvorking the vvork vvwherefore it vvvas sent, there is a difference  
be-

a Detinit.  
Lib. 3. c. 30.  
Honorem tā-  
quam religio-  
is habere pos-  
sunt, stuporem  
tanquam mira-  
non possunt.

betwixt the customable beholding of Gods ordinary vvorkes, the Sacraments; and a miracle. For as Augustine a faith of the sacred Scripture, the Serpent, the Sacraments, they may be honored as matters religious, but vvondred at as matters of marvel they may not be. The infidell or unlearned if he had fallen down in the mean time and spoken, it had been but his rudenes, not yet vvell understanding the order of the Church. VVhat men do either amazed vvith the Majestie of God in a miracle, or of ignorance being but nev couverts to testifie their conversion before the congregation as vvitnesses, doth not helpe the Doctors cause. Thirdly, suppose they had fallen down in the mean time, yet their falling down vvvas not for adoration of the fire, or the vvord, but of God, Kneeling at the Sacrament is for reverence of the Sacrament, as vve shal make manifest. But as I haue sayd, their falling down vvvas not in the meane time of the vvorking of the fire, or the prophesying of the Prophets, and so serueth not the Doctor to the very pretence of falling down at the Sacrament.

He denieth that they bow their knees at the Sacrament, for the religions respect and reverence vvwhich they cary to the Sacrament, but to Christ, for the religions respect & reverence that by it they are taught to giue to him. I see men make no account vvhat they deny, providing they can insnare simple people, and bring them to the doing of the act. The Doctor sayd othervvayes, at the pretended assembly, and the act penned by him and some others, vvhen it vvvas reformed, the copie vvwhereof subscribed by the clarke come in my hands speaketh as I have already alledged. It is there ordained, that vve kneele in reverence of so diuine a Mysterie to vvite, as is the Sacrament, or holy communion, vvwhereof mention is made in the vvords immediatly preceeding. And the vvords following, in remembrance of so mysticall an union, as vve are made partokers of thereby to vvite, by the mysterie, declare that by the vvord mysterie, is meant the Sacrament. The like speech he hath in this book, that the communion of the body and blood of Christ is offered to vs by the sacred mysteries vvwhich are given at the table. It is an usuall tearme of the ancients to call the Sacrament, sometimes mysteries in the plurall number, sometime mysterie in the singular number, as the Doctor doth also varie the tearm in this book. And in the English

Confession the bread and vvine are called the heavenly mysteries of the body and blood of Christ. To kneele then in religious reverence of the Sacrament, is to adore it. For all religious kneeling is a gesture not of ordinary and common reverence, but of adoration. Seeing therefore the publick intent of the inforced act is Idolatrie, vvhatsloever be the private intent of the communicant, he is guiltie of Idolatry in kneeling. **A** man may go to Rome, and take the Sacrament at the Antichrists hand, if private intention will save him from the guiltines of Idolatry.

Our conformitie with our neighbour Kirk, doth also manifest the intent of our act. The disputers against Mr. Rogers, Mr. Hutton, D. Cowel, and D. Spark, prove out of their vvriters, that the reverence of the Sacrament is intended. I vvill onely set down Mr. Huttons words. Our bowing at the Sacrament (saith he) is an outvvard reverence meet to be performed because of that holy action in hand, namely our religious communicating; partly to stirre up in others a more religious estimation of those divine seales, partly to remove all prophane thoughts of Epicures and contemptners, partly to put a difference between the ordinary bread & wine, & those Sacraments, to which we give more reverence, because they are more the ordinary bread & wine. That book of cōmon prayer, whereto they are tied by the statute of Q. Elisabeth, giveth also to understand, that kneeling at the communion is enjoyned upon this ground, that the Sacrament might not be profaned, but held in a reverent and holy estimation amongst us.

I heare that our men have put in another word to colour the matter. In reverence of God, and of so divine a mystery; but that will not help the matter. For God will be the totall & onlie object of adoration, he will have no compartner, & he will have it to be directed to him alone immediatly.

But what if by the word mysterie be understood the action of celebration, that will not help the matter; For the action of celebration is nothing else but the mysticall rites and ceremonies employed about the elemēts, giving, receiving, eating, drinking. I may not kneele in reverence of the mysticall rites, more then of the mysticall elements. I may not lawfully adore actions more then substances. No action never so mysticall or holy, is the right object of our adoration.

Seeing therefore we kneele in reverence of the Sacramēt, &

it is in part the object of our adoration, we are sayd as properly to bow before it, as the Papist to bow before his image. Yea, suppose a thing situate before us vvanting life, be not the object of our adoration, as a vvall or a tree, yet are we said properly to bow before it in our vulgar language. howbeit speaking Greeke we would not use the vvord Enopion to that purpose. David or Daniel may be justly sayd to bow toward the Temple, they being farre removed from the sight of it, or toward the Ark, the Ark being out of sight in the holy of holies. The elements are not onely in our sight, but are also the object of our reverend vvorship, as the crucifix is to the Papist. And admit that the speech were not proper to say we bow down before any dead element, the doctors phrasis is sufficient for us. For we may not bow down toward a creature, as the object of our adoration. Yea and further, we may not bow by direction and ordinance novv under the nevve Testament, toward any place or creature, there to vvorship God, as the people of old, did toward the Ark, vvhere God manifested himselfe by a singular manner of presence, sitting betvyixt the Cherubins.

It is manifest then, that the publick intent of the act is Idolatrous, seeing the elements are made an object of our reverent kneeling. Yet let us examine the Doctors private, but pretended intent. 1. If we kneele onely to Christ at that time and place, vvhen the elements, in the sight and use of them, as instrumentall causes, vvaken and stirr us up to give that bodily worship; then at what time, and in what place soever, we are moved and stirred up by any creature, work of God, word, Sacrament, type, figure, monument to acknowledge our dutie of bodily worship to God, we should give it in that place, at the same instant time. For the Doctor did except onely Images and Idols, as not fitt to teach us any thing of God, and consequently, that we should not bowe before them. But of this purpose we spake a litle before. See also Perth Assembly. 2. If I kneele onely in regard of the pretended prayer of the soule, and yet in the mean time of my kneeling, which is an externall worship. I perform an other action of divine service. I confound two parts of externall worship. I am praying, and in that regard, as is pretended, kneeling; and in the meane time I am beholding with mine eyes the mysticall actions, hearke-

hearkening with the eares to the audible words, receiving the elements vwith my hands, eating and drinking vwith my mouth, and so one person at one time is ~~as~~ <sup>as</sup> doing two sundry parts of externall vvorship. For these actions are not the actions and gestures of prayer and adoration. The diuers kindes of Gods vvorship should not be confounded vwith other; but specially none of them ought to be confounded with prayer and adoration for eschewing of Idolatrie. Did ADAM eate of the tree of life, the people of God eate of the Paschall supper, or the manna, the Priests eates of the things sacrificed, of the presence bread, or other holy meate, and adore in the mean time also. The Lord would have externall adoration superceeded during the use of the meanes, the vvord & the Sacraments, both for eschewing of Idolatrie, lest vve adore the meanes; and of confusion and distraction lest the parts of Gods vvorship should undecently be confounded, and our hearts distracted. And so kneeling in this action doth not best beseme this action, as the act would insinuate. Babylon is not so confused: for they think the actions of eating, drinking, taking, beholding, vvhen they are upon their knees, and in time of their prayer, are employed immediatly about their God.

3. Either the soule is vvholly employed in prayer during the time that the communicant is upon his knees, and then the actions of beholding, taking, eating, drinking, are idle, or rather hurtfull because they distract the soule, or the soule is not totally exercised in prayer, and then kneeling must be in regard of the actions and elements vvhereabout they are employed, as well as of prayer, and this is Idolatry.

4. If the actions outvvard employed about the elements, and the internall considerations and actions correspondent be the principall vvork of the communicant: and on the other part, the prayers be but mentall ejaculations, and occasionall, then is the gesture of kneeling principally for the actions, and the elements vvhereabout they are employed. But so it is, that these actions employed about the elements, and the internall actions correspondent, are the principall vvork of the communicant, the mentall ejaculations of prayer and praise, are but occasionall and incident. Therefore kneeling is principally for the actions and the elements, vvhereabout they are employed.

5. If mentall ejaculations give place to all other parts of Gods vvorship,

and require no bodily adoration, as we may see at the hearing of the word, our mentall ejaculations require not kneeling. The it vvill follow, that kneeling is not at all in regard of these mentall ejaculations of prayer and praite, but of the publick worship commanded; that is, of the celebration of the actions, and signes whereabout they are imployed; and this is also Idolatry. As for publick prayer in the act of receiving, they cannot pretend it. For no such prayer is set down by any Canon of our Kirk. The disputers foresayd have layd open the nakednes of this pretence also.

So vve may see the carriage of every communicant, declarereth that kneeling is for reverence of the elements, let the communicant pretend what he please. Next, let him pretend what he please, he is to be expounded according to the publick intent of the act injoyning him, which is Idolatrous. Make never so many respects besides, either in your private conceit, or in the act, this publick intent being one, doth marre all the rest. The Lord vvill not be mocked with relations, but respecteth the act, and not the intencion saith Billon,

h Obedience, h howbeit to another purpose.  
Page 347.

Sec. 10.

He denieth that our kneeling hardeneth the Papist in his Idolatry, because we kneele not in that respect that they do: yea that they are no lesse vehement against our kneeling then against our sitting; but daily experience doth prove the contrary of this allegiance, that the Papist is hardened in his superiour sort of Idolatry, by our inferiour sort. The Papists are offended at us for not kneeling upon the conceit of transubstantiation, but they are vvell content to see us kneele upon a religious estimation & reverence of the element, & the mystis call actions. They are content to see us borrow ther rites to decore our religion withal, to kneele at the same time, in the same place, after the same manner, & to the same general end of adoration, howbeit upon different respects. The Doctor would make men beleewe that there is no Idolatrous worship of a creature, except we take it for a God. VVhen as it is also Idolatry to communicate religious knee-worship to that which we are perswaded is but a meere creature.

Sec. 11.

He denieth, that kneeling offendeth the weake brethren: yea many affirm that there is no gesture can sufficiently expresse



preſſe the reverence and reſpect that in this action we owe to God, as the Doctor alledgeth. I underſtand not what the weak brethren be of whom he meaneth; but well I know, that all the Godly Profeſſors of the Land are offended at it, & juſtly. They have heard our preachers theſe 60 yeares by paſt teach otherwiſe & in the ſubſcribing, and ſwearing to the ſecond confeſſion of Faith, require perſons of all eſtates to abjure it. If they ſhall now heare the Preachers defend it, and urge the practice of the ſame, what ſhall they beleieve? may they not think that the reſt of the doctrine which they have taught theſe many yeares by-paſt, they vvill recant, if they vvere but a little put at. I know none for mine own part content, but blind ignorants or ſuperſtitious people. The old vvives that knocked on their breſts, and glowred up to the bread, when Mr. Galloway delivered them the elements, were very well content. Vile atheiſts, and blaſphemers of Chriſts name, can both buffer Chriſt rent his wounds, blaſpheme his name, and yet kneele and ſay, Haile maſter. Some politicians indifferent in matters of religion, can be content to do any thing, whether they have delight in the matter, or no delight at all. Some, it may be, and I feare too many, think as the familists do, that they may lawfully preſent themſelves to any vvorſhip which the prince or Magiſtrate ſhall enjoin, ſuppoſe it were never ſo Idolatrous. A number did kneele becauſe they were ſeduced by corrupt teachers, temporizing or ſeeking benefit or preferment. Many kneeled for Feare of looſing their offices, and eſtates, & ſome of them have been grieved in conſcience for ſo doing. But the Feare of danger and trouble vvill not hold men excuſed. If the Doctor would obtain that no man ſhould be urged, vve ſhould then ſee what manner of men theſe be whom he alledged to be ſo well contented.

The determination of kneeling, when and where, and in what caſes is to be uſed, is left to the determination of the kirk, ſaith the Doctor. Be it ſo, where the word hath not already determined. But. 1. The exemplary ſitting of Chriſt. 2. The uſe of the Table. 3. The Sacramentall breaking of the bread after the thankſgiving. 4. The enunciative Form of deliverie of the Sacramental word. 5. The generalitie of the Sacramental word. 6. The commandment 1 Cor. 11. to communicate

together. 7. The precept, Divide it amongst you. 8. The semblance of a supper or Feast. 5. The discharge of vvil-worship. 10. The discharge of conformity in rites and ceremonies with Idolators. 11. The discharge of kneeling religiously in reverence of any creature. 12. The discharge of dangerous provocations to the grossest Idolatry of the Papists, do all discharge kneeling. See al those particulars treated in Perth Assembly.

Howbeit we differ before from the Kirke of France by our sitting, yet we do differ Further both from the Kirke of France, and from our selves by kneeling: yea, vve differ from all the well-reformed Kirkes round about us.

The Doctor saith, if the ancient Church might have lawfully interchaged kneeling, a gesture ordained by God himself into standing at prayer, touching which there is no precept, how much more may our Church interchange sitting never commanded, and never or very seldome practised in Gods publick worship with kneeling a gesture commanded by God, and most agreeable to this Sacrament. VVe have already made manifest, that at the religious Feasts under the Law, at the Sacrament of the Supper under the new Testament they did sit. In the time of the preaching or prophelying, it was likewise the ordinary custome to sit both in the Synagogue of the Iewes, and the Assemblies of Christians, 1 Cor. 14. 30. Acts. 16. 13. Acts. 20. 9. Luke. 4. 28. 29. Acts. 14. 16. Luke 10. 39. I think no man will deny but the ministration of the Sacraments, and the preaching and hearing of the word, are parts of Gods publick worship. If by publick worship the Doctor do meane the solemne & publick prayers onely, then he speaketh not to the purpose. Neither doth Calvin say, that kneeling in time of prayer is simply a divine ordinance, but he sayth, it is so human a tradition that it is also divine. It is divine in so farre as it is a part of that comelines which is recommended to us by the apostle. The Prophets upon singular occasions as they were moved by the spirit, exhorted the people to come and bow down before the Lord. But these exhortations were not precepts. for then Christ had sinned if he had not kneeled in the times of thanksgiving; but we have already manifested that he sate. Then David likewise had sinned when he sate before the Lord. 2 Sam. 7. 18. To expone sitting standing, were catachresticall indeed. To expone sit-  
ting

ring remaining, will not agree with the text. To devise a mylerie for that sitting Peter Martyr sayth, it is without a warrant. If there had been a commandement to kneele in time of prayer, then Ieholaphat and all Iuda standing before the Lord with their yong ones, their vvives and Children in time of prayer, 2. Chron. 20. 5. 6. 13. had sinned, and the ancient custome of the Iewes to pray standing, had been unlawfull, Of this custome see Perth Assembly. It was the office of the Levites to stand evening and morning to give thankes and praise the Lord, 2 Chron. 23. 29. The tribe of Levi is sayd to be separated to stand before the Lord to Minister to him, and to blesse in his name. VVhat the ancient Kirk did in changing kneeling in time of prayer into standing, insignification of their joy for Christs resurrection, and that so precisely, that it was accounted a great sin to do otherwayes, on the Lords day, &c betwixt Pasce, and Pentecost, is nothing to us, who are not to follow them in such conceits. Paul kneeled betwixt Pasce and Pentecost the time forbidden by the ancients, as vve may see Acts. 20. 36. and had no minde of such devises.

The Doctor alledgeth, that our first reformers established sitting onlie as a fit ceremony for the time, to abolishe the opinion of transubstantiation. But this he alledgeth against his own knowledge, and I am sure against the truth. For in the first booke of discipline, in the second head thereof, it is ordained as a perpetuall gesture because most agreeable to the institution. In the parliament holden anno 1572. it was enacted, that if any man did communicate otherwayes with the Sacraments, then as they were then truely ministered in the reformed Kirkes of this realme, should be holden infamous, unable to sit or stand in judgement, perfew or beare office, or to be witnesses or assisers against any professing the true religion. Shall vve now have a new act in the contrarie, for this English guise, or rather old Papisticall manner. In the second confession of Faith, vve detest all allegories, rites, signes and traditions added to the true ministration of the Sacraments, without or against the vvord of God. Did any preacher preach otherwayes till now? And at Perth Assembly the Doctor confessed that yet still the former order vvas best, but he would please the King, and avert his Majesties vvraath from this Kirk.

Kirk. P. Martyr writing to the Polonian Ministers and Professors anno 1556. Vvilled them to pluck up superstition & Idolatry by the roots, if othervvayes they plucked onely at the Leaves, the Fruits and the Flowers, it vvould spring up again as it had done in some places already. I know vvhat I speake sayth he. And this he spake vvhen our neighbour Kirk resvolved to Poperie in Queen Maries dayes. But chiefly he desired them to make a sincere reformation in this Sacrament, vvhere there are, saith he, pestilent seeds of Idolatry, which except they be taken away, the Kirk of Christ vvill never be decorated vvith pure and sincere worship. And again he saith, as the Sacraments ought not to be contemned, so men ought not to give them greater honor then the institution will suffer.

Bucer in his censure vvritten at the desire of Cramer, sayth, that if vve love God and our Saviour Christ none of these things, vvords, or gestures, vvill find or keepe place amongst us, vvvhich have appearance of affinitie vvith the impieties & abominations brought in by the Antichrist upon the holy mysteries, or vvvhich may be taken hold of to make up, any commendation of them, howbeit unjustly and vvithout just cause offered. A vvhole Synod did condemne this gesture for the danger of Bread-worship, as may be seen in Festus Hommius harmonie of the Belgick Sinods. Our first Reformers upon the same considerations abandoned this gesture simpliciter, and not for a time onely.

He pretendeth a needlesse Feare of Prophanitie and contempt, which may by time creep in by our former order. If it creep in, it is to be amended, and the Form and order of the institution is not to be broken or adulterate for remedy of the same. For as Bucer saith, neither the perversnes of the wicked, can vitiate the things which the Lord hath instituted, neither ought vve to intermit them for their abuse. But I appeale to the consciences of all true Professors, if ever they did see any exercises so gracious, powerfull and heavenly, as were our communions. It is vvell known what graceles, confused, cold & disordered communions vve had in sundry parts this last Yeare, where kneeling was put in practise. Some complained for vvant of the Bread, some for vvant of the wine. Mr Galloway quarrelled some of the communicants for not kneeling, vvhen he vvvas in the very act of delivering the

a Loricom. p.  
1111. quae  
porro nisi sub-  
blata fuerint  
nunquam Ec-  
clesia Christi  
puro sincero-  
que cultu erit  
ornata, etc.

b Cap. 9. Ni-  
hilque loci  
vel invenient  
vel retinebunt  
apud nos eae  
res omnes  
verba, et ge-  
stus, in quibus  
vel appearet  
esse aliquid  
santis impie-  
tibus affine,  
aut ad usum  
rapiatur (qua-  
quam impro-  
be et absque  
data causa)  
harum suarum  
impietatum  
commendationem et pie-  
tatem.

c Ibid haec  
ut nulla nobis  
potest impio-  
rum vitiae  
perversitas, ita  
nec propter  
illorum abu-  
sum intermit-  
tere debemus.

the element. Such prettie dialogues had we at the last communion, as was matter of much talk afterwarde.

He purged our Kirk in this book before of Arrianisme, and now he maketh much adoe as if the maintainers of a table-gesture did favour of Arrianisme, or plead for equalitie with Christ. VVhen the Arminians were like to prevaile in the Low-countries, then did the Doctor every where reason for them. This is the man vvho maketh a counterfeit out-cry, as if our Kirk vvere in danger of Arrianisme; howbeit he doth understand there is no appearance of any such matter more novv, then vvvas from the beginning of the Reformation. Neither did Christ ever institute any order vvwhich should give just occasion to any malicious or perverse person to pretend such Feares.

VVhat a vain alledgeance is it to say, that kneeling vvill serve to declare our union vvith other reformed Kirkes; seeing the best Reformed Kirkes do abhorre kneeling. His other alledgeance is as Foolish, that kneeling vvill vvin some Papists to our Profession. Is this the vvay to cure a man of the Fever, to faine a Fever? God set up a partition vvall of many rites and ceremonies betvvixt his people and Idolaters, and tooke not the course of conformitie with them to make profelites. P. Martyr sayth, a That rite in the administration of the Sacraments is to be imbraced vvwhich is most simple, and furthest removed from Papistical toyes and ceremonies, and cometh nearest to that puritie vvwhich Christ and his Apostles used. This vvvas his judgement after he had left England, & had experience what such matters meant. Doth not daily experience teach us, that vvhere kneeling and the like ceremonies do flourish most, Papists do increase most? Are not our Papists already insulking upon us, and saying that yve are returning home again to them?

There vvvas an argument much made of be the D. in Perth Assembly, vvwhich I find not in this Book of Resolutionis. To vvitt, vvhatsoever benefite vve may crave of God upon our knees, vve may receive it upon our knees. VVe may crave the Sacrament upon our knees. Ergo. But appearantlie the D. hath thought shame of it since that time. And indeed if the proposition vvvere true, the King ought, or may kneele vvhen he receaveth homage from his subjectis: The Brid-

G.

groom

a Locicom-  
mun. p. 1111.  
In ritu Sacra-  
mentorum ad-  
ministrando-  
rum is amplex  
crendus est  
qui fuerit  
quam simpli-  
cissimus, atque  
a Papisticis  
nugis et cere-  
moniis ma-  
xime remo-  
tus: et ad puri-  
tatem qua  
Christus cum  
Apostolis usus  
est, qua pluri-  
mum accessit.

groome vvhhen he taketh his Brid by the hand: and everie one of us when vve receave food or phisike. Mr. Galloway wanting better reasons did notwithstanding with a little resistance shew use this same argument in the Great Kirk of Edinburgh upon the Lords-day before the last communion as the cheif reason that after studie, meditation and prayer gave him Resolution. VVhat spirituall blessing in Gods publick vvorship I may ask of God upon my knees, I may receave upon my knees. VVhen N. denyed this proposition to the late Bishop of Galloway Mr. Cowper he could proceed no further. I demand wherfor should vve not kneele in the receat and fruition of temporall benefits and blessings aswell as Spirituall, seeing vve crave of God conforme to the perfitte paterne of Prayer daylie bread and temporall benefits necessar for this our naturall life. VVill they not say, because Gods benefits temporall are presented to vs be sensible creatures, and therefore if vve did kneele, vve should kneele before creatures, Fire, VVater, VVine, Bread and so forth of the rest. Do we not the like at the Sacrament, are not the seales of the Spirituall blessings presented to vs be sensible creatures. If ze say the one sort is Holy and sacred and so is not the other: then first it vvill follow that vve kneel not ratione doni in respect of a blessing or benefite bestowed, for then vve should kneele in the receat of the temporall blessing and benefite also: but that vve kneele because that sensible pledge of the spirituall blessing is ane holie thing or creature consecrated & set apart to a holy use. Bot to Kneele religiouslie in that respect before anie creature whatsoever is Idolatrie. That condition which is added: In Gods publick VVorship, vvil not help the matter. For vvwhether vve kneel in or out of Gods publick vvorship in the forsaide respect, it is still Idolatrie to kneel religiouslie in regard of the holines of any creature. Nixt ther is equinocasion in this vvord vvorship. For some time vvorship of God is taken in a generall sence, for the fear and reverence of God, service of God, or any other religious or Ecclesiasticall action, ROM. 1. 9. MATTH. 15. 9. ACT. 18. 7. ACT. 18. 13. ACT.



ACT. 24. 14. PHILIP. 3. 3. DEVT. 10. 12.  
COLL. 2. 18. 23. 2 SAM. 15. 8. EXOD. 3. 12.  
And so the vvord vvorship in our language serveth to expresse divers vvords in the originall latrevoov, doulevoov, threikevoov sebowaj, &c. In this generall sence the preaching of the vvord, the celebration of the Lords Supper, the Ministration of Baptisme, singing of Psalmes, &c. Ar publick vvorships of God. The Preacher Prayerth upon his knees for a blessing vvhen he shall Preach and consequentlie in Gods publick vvorship ROM. 1. 9. ROM. 15. 16. Shall he therfore Preach Kneeling, vvhen he findeth Gods blessing assisting him. The hearers do crave likewise a blessing upon their hearing. If the hearers as they are diverslie affected with good motiouns in time of Sermon shall kneele vvhen others do sit: and the Sitters againe kneele vvhen others are risen, if at an other time they finde themselves moved, vvhat a sort of hearers should vve have. Gods publick should not be confounded vvith mens peculiar vvorship and devotioun. It is Gods Commandement, that the hearer should hear, vvhen the Preacher doeth speake. This Commandement should not be broken, for the privat motions and secret ejaculations of the soule in the time of hearing. Even so at the Sacrament the communicant is to observe the ordour, rules and rites of the institution, vvwhich vvill not admit Kneeling as vve have often sayd. It is therfore unlawfull to kneele in the act, seeing that vve cannot kneele without making many breaches both in the secound Commandement in generall, and in the institution in particular. All vvwhich are set down at lenth in PERTH ASSEMBLIE, the summe whereof I have sett down before PAGE 45. The vvord VVorship is taken againe and that most usuallie for kneeling and prostration and serveth in this sence to expresse the Greek vvord proskuneo as MATTH. 2. 2. REVEL. 13. 4. 1 COR. 14. 25. & MATT. 8. 2. and the Hebrew vvord Hiftachavah; and this is performed in time of prayer or thanksgiving. To kneel in time of Gods

Gods publick vvorship in this strict sence, that is in time of solemne and publick prayers no man doeth call in question, & is not pertinent to this purpose. If Mr. Galloways penitions had not tempted him at his prayers studie and meditations, he might soone have come to better resolutions. He had another reason that same daye of as little waight. To vvitt, The people of Israel stood in Egypt at the passeover as they vver commanded: and sate in Canaan. VVhy may not vve likewise change sitting in kneeling as they did standing in sitting. First it is onlie conjecturall that they stood, it is not certaine. For no circumstance in the text Exod. 12, doeth enforce any such thing. Next, if it vvas commanded it vvas enjoyned onlie for that night as many other ceremonies vver peculiar to that time, as to eate in their houses vvher they had made their residence in Egypt, the sprinkling of the side posts with blood, the eating in hast, the not going out of house. Christ and his Apostles went out of the house that same night to the Mount of olives Matth. 26. 19. 20. 30. Seing therfore the Lord did not set down a Law for standing at the Paschall supper, and the people of Israel had not the like reason to stand at other times as at the first passeover in Egypt: ther vvas nothing to hinder their sitting. That standing was onlie occasional, because of their hastie departure out of Egypt, bot sitting vvas the ordinarie gesture at all religious Feasts. Put the case it vver certaine that they stood at the Paschall supper even to the captivitye, vvich is denyed be Scaliger in the last edition of his book de Emendatione temporum: and that they took up sitting after that, yet that change of standing about the table into sitting is bot the change of one table gesture into another. Bot to change sitting into kneeling is to chang a table-gesture into a gesture of adoration, and to bring in a change upon the institution as vve have sayd. VVhen D. Denisons book come in Mr. Galloway his hands, he made a new onsett in the pulpit upon the Lords day following and caused sing after Sern on the 95 Psalme, as if he had bene singing the triumphe. Bot certainly he produced no new reason vvorthie the answering howbeit he did flee vvith other mens vvings. I vvish that man sawe his one vveaknes and insufficiencie for such a place. Mr. Ramfay proponed an Argument at the meeting upon the tuesday before the last communion, vvich he bragged he

vvould

would manteine against all the Theologues in Europe. To wit, wher the soul should necessarilie bow, the body may lawfully bow. In the act of receaving the Sacramentall elements the soul should necessarilie bow. For we should receave vvith humilitie. The answer is easie, first the proposition is to be denied. The 3 children no doubt bowed ther souls, vvhen they vver presented before the golden Image. Bot ther bowed souls vver averle from the Image and looking upon God. For vve may not Imagine that the soul throweth about as the bodie doeth. A man surprised vvith a suddaine tentation, when he is gazing on a crucifixe ought to bow his soule necessarilie bot he must not bow his bodie. Nehemias standing before King Artaxerxes Nehem. 2. 4. bowed his soul, bot might not bow his bodie. A man ryding through a deepe water, and in perill of drouning should necessarilie bow his Soul. In a word whatsoever vve be doing, or whatsoever thing be sett before vs, vve should bow our soul, when we ar assaulted with danger either internall or externall, or vvhen vve have some present neid of Gods presence & blessing, whether vve be ryding, eating, lying, hearing the vvord, or participating the Sacramēt. As for the assumption; we bow the soul in the act of receaving if ther be neid, and as vve find our selves moved to begg grace to strenthen us, vvhen vve find our Faith weak, or in such like caces. Bot that bowing is nothing, but the mentall ejaculations of prayer and praise wherof vve have often spoken befor vvwhich are occasional onlie, subtile, swift and secret. For to say that the soul should bow by vvay of internall adoration of prayer and praise during all the time of the action is to exclude the principal vvork of the soule, that is meditation, consideration of the analogie of the signes and thinges signified, and the application of Faith, as vve have sayd before. Humilitie is not this bowing of the soul, vvwhich is internall adoration, bot ane habite accompanieng us in all our relligious exercises, in the hearing of the vvord as well as in receaving the Sacrament. Farther it vvill not follow that we should bow the bodie, if vve bow the soule at that time as I have declared in the refutation of the proposition. All the 12 transgressions noted befor do hinder us to bow our bodie at that time. M. Struthers greatest arguments wer terrible knocks upon the pulpit. Mr. Sidelesse told the people of the threadbare reason

son drawn from the circumstances of time & place accessoir to the first institution : wherof se befor Page 11.

Sing therfor kneeling in the act of receaving is not a thing indifferent, but unlawfull in respect of the manie transgressions committed by the same, it is the duetie of everie good Christian making conscience of his vvayes, speciallie in the solemne worship of God, to detest the same. But vvhat if libertie be offered to sitt, or stand, or kneel? Remember first that no particular person hes power to make that offer. The enforced act of the pretendit assemblie tendeth onlie to uniformitie. Next, remember the trick which the Ministers of Edinbrough played. VVhen they had allured some people with this offer to come to their communion, they wrought upon them divers vvayes to make them to kneele, and dashed the Sillie ones. Tempt not the Lord: take paines rather to seek abroade nor to cast your selves in a snare, or to countenance such confusions. Ye ought not so farr as in you lieth to depart one haile bredth from the institution, as I alledged be for out of Calvin. Thridlie consider that this offer will onne serve for an introduction to uniformitie in kneeling. For when that confusion shall take place, then shall they cry out as D. Spark hath done: that some moderate severitie must be used to remove that offensive diversitie, and to reduce all men to uniformitie. The conclusion of Synodus Petricovienfis alledged be them now against us, shall not serve then for a defence to us against them. And this moderate severitie shall prove sharpe persecution, which is already begun. If the observacion of holy dayes be first urged it is the duetie likewise of everie good Christian making conscience of his oath, promise, subscription, former profession, and puritie of Gods worship, to vvithdrawe his countenance from the same. A day of rest vvithout religious exercises is an idle day, not a holy day. Religious exercises are the life of a holy day. And therfor our Kirk woul not approve the Confession of Helvetia in that point, howbeit prophanitie and other accessorie abuses of poperie wer not allowed be that Confession. The verie observacion itself of an anniversarie Festivall day vvith cessation from work, and religious exercises, the two cheif elements of a Festivall day was judged superstition. As may be seene be the continuall abstinence of our Kirk from extraordinar

dinar Preaching upon these dayes, the censures acts and articles of the generall assemblies, the Confession of Faith, the first Book of discipline. See Perth Assemblie p. 63. Nixt by your countenancing of holy dayes ye countenanne the vitious constitution, and shames proceedings of Perths Pretendit and Null assemblie. Thridly ye open a door to kneeling and all the rest of the English ceremonies, vvhich will rut h in, after vve have given vway to any one of them. And then when we shall be made fullie conforme to our neighbour Kirk, we shall turne in a trice to Papistrie, when it shall please authoritie by found of Trumpet to command us. For PETRVS CVDSENIVS a Iesuit viewing the state of the English Kirk Anno 1608. gave this judgement in his Book de desperata Calvinistarum causa, that the state of religion in England was such, as that it might be easilie chaged to the Catholik Roman, & that they wer not properlie to be called heretiks, but schismatiks. This is recorded by Francis Malon in his book of the consecration of the Bishops of England. The terrible inquisition of the high commission is sett above our heads, wher the acts of some Pseudosynods, corrupted, and slavish conventions are put in Execution by the two Archbishops, & all the ordinarie iudicatories ecclesiasticall past by. If these two bone companions, prettie football men, sometimes fellow presbyters in one presbyterie, still brethren in evill, had bene casten foorth of the ministrie, when they were nere the point of suspensio for prophaning the Lords day, they had not bene able instruments to cast out vvorthe men out of the ministrie in thir times. To conclude the religion of the best Reformed Kirks round about ws is persecuted in our persones under the name of Puritanisme, and Papists do increase.

For Methode it behoved me to follow the Doctors disordered stepps. For matter I have studied to brevite, referring the Reader to Perth Assemblie for farther, if he be desirous. For Ieschewed repetition, so farr, as I might.

*Anno 1619. Novemb. 5.*

V. Calcutwood p. 736



C 4364  
40035 SL

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE  
**HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY**

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION